

2018

"Canada is my home. It is all I've ever known": The Impact of Bill C-43 on Permanent Resident in Canada

Erica Subramaniam

Wilfrid Laurier University, subr3830@mlaurier.ca

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.wlu.ca/brantford_sjce

 Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#), and the [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Subramaniam, Erica, "'Canada is my home. It is all I've ever known': The Impact of Bill C-43 on Permanent Resident in Canada" (2018). *Social Justice and Community Engagement*. 32.
https://scholars.wlu.ca/brantford_sjce/32

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Laurier Brantford at Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Social Justice and Community Engagement by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

“Canada is my home. It is all I’ve ever known”: The impact of Bill C-43 on Permanent Residents
in Canada

by

Erica Subramaniam

MA, Wilfrid Laurier University, 2018

Major Research Paper

Completed in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Master of Arts,

Social Justice and Community Engagement

Wilfrid Laurier University

Abstract

This paper examines the impact of Bill C-43, *“The Faster Removal of Foreign Criminals Act,”* on permanent residents (PRs) who immigrated to Canada as a youth and have come to regard Canada as their “home” despite their precarious migration status. Through qualitative research methods, data on the experiences of PRs and their understandings of “home,” “place,” belonging and consciousness was collected through interviews. Jay and Trevor’s stories are presented through a case study research design, highlighting their complex identities and experiences while also examining how the risk of deportation under Bill C-43 can strip them from all they have ever known –their lives in Canada. This paper argues that migrants within the Canadian context face similar logics of exclusion that can be traced from colonial periods (i.e. early Indigenous and white settler relations in Canada). To fully view Bill C-43 through a social justice lens, it must be placed within the context of colonialism and viewed as a mechanism that sustains and legitimizes the colonial state. Bill C-43 is an example of a harmful policy that continues to reinforce “White Canada” rhetoric. It is illustrated that the colonial logics of exclusion are clearly implemented into immigration law, in that keeping migrants as “outsiders” in need of heightened surveillance, control, and consequences allows for the maintenance of the Canadian state. This paper argues that Bill C-43 operates as a mechanism that has the potential to displace PRs who are constructed as “dangerous,” thus illustrating the intolerance for those perceived as “outsiders.”

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, thank you to my advisor, Dr. Bree Akesson, for all your support, patience, and dedication to my project. When I first walked through your doors in September, I was unaware of how lucky I would be to have such a caring, passionate, knowledgeable and inspiring supervisor. Now, one year later, while reflecting on my entire MRP process, it is safe to say that I could not imagine going through this with anyone else. You've always supported my ideas while also challenging me to push myself further to become a stronger researcher. I am grateful for your words of encouragement, positivity and warmth during those times of increased stress and anxiety. You have a heart of gold and you are truly special! Thank you for guiding me and showing me that there are amazing people like you in this world.

Thank you to my 2nd reader, Anh Ngo, for being such a valuable member of my committee. I am grateful for the knowledge you shared with me and the insight you brought to my project. Thank you for always being on board and encouraging me during every step of this journey.

For those who participated in this research, thank you for sharing your experiences and stories. Your courage and willingness to share provided such rich knowledge and added a unique and very important insight into the broader topic of social justice.

AK, thank you for always being my number one supporter. Thank you for believing in me and reminding me of who I am, what I can achieve, and that I could overcome anything that stands in my way. Your love and support continues to fuel me. For all the things you do for me, big or small, thank you!

Last, but not least, thank you to my mom, Gloria. You have played such an important role in my life. You have been there with me through my highest highs, and my lowest lows, and I am so thankful for you. As my mother, best friend, hero, and role model, you are, and have always been, the most incredible person I know. At many times, life has proven to be very tough for our family, and during these times, you have always been there for me, supported me, and reminded me of my worth and to always reach for the stars. The older I get, the more I realize how much you sacrificed for me. I would not be able to reach the level of success I have if it wasn't for you and for what you have done for me. You made all this possible. I am so fortunate to have been raised by the person I have always looked up to, and I hope that in every aspect of my life I make you proud. If I become just *half* the woman you are, I will be satisfied. Thank you, mom.

INTRODUCTION	1
ABDOUL’S STORY	1
OVERVIEW OF RESEARCH TOPIC	5
LITERATURE REVIEW	7
THE RISE OF “WHITE CANADA” AND THE CREATION OF THE “OTHER”	7
THE REINFORCED NARRATIVE OF THE “OTHER” & “DANGEROUS CRIMINAL FOREIGNER”	15
THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE “DANGEROUS CRIMINAL ALIEN:” THE RACIALIZATION OF CRIME WITH RELATION TO IMMIGRATION IN CANADA	17
“HOME,” BELONGING & THE HARM OF FORCED DISLOCATION: ABDOL ABDI’S CASE	20
“US” VS “THEM”: WHO BELONGS?	27
THEORETICAL APPROACH	28
UNDERSTANDING “HOME”	29
UNDERSTANDING “PLACE”	30
PLACE ATTACHMENT	32
PLACE IDENTITY	35
METHODOLOGY	38
CASE STUDIES AS THE RESEARCH DESIGN/STRATEGY	40
SAMPLE	42
METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION	44
LIMITATIONS OF RESEARCH	45
RESULTS	46
JAY’S STORY	46
TREVOR’S STORY	48
ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	51
PR STATUS AS A MARKER OF DIFFERENCE: EXPLORING THE LEGAL CONSCIOUSNESS OF JAY AND TREVOR	52
GUYANESE AS A “BACKGROUND”: FEELING “CANADIAN” LIKE “EVERYONE ELSE”	54
FEELINGS OF BELONGING IN A DIVERSE CITY: “I AM WHO I AM BASED ON WHERE I HAVE BEEN”	58
EXPLORING BILL C-43: THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE “FOREIGN CRIMINAL”	64
CONCLUSION	70
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, ANALYSIS & DISCUSSION	70
IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE, POLICY & RESEARCH	73
BREAKING THE DIVIDE	77
WORKS CITED	78

Introduction

Abdoul's Story

When he was six years old, Abdoukader “Abdoul” Abdi, entered into Canada as a Somalian refugee and obtained permanent resident (PR) status (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018). In a video interview with The National, Abdoul explains his arrival to Canada as the following, “I was very young, there was conflicts in my country, my two aunts had saved me and my sister from over there and we came to this country” (Barton, 2018, 00:59). Abdoul began his journey in Nova Scotia feeling like “everyone else,” and throughout his years attending school, he was unaware that he was a permanent resident (Barton, 2018, 02:14). Abdoul saw himself as a “Canadian just like any other kid” (Barton, 2018, 02:14). While Abdoul’s official nationality is Somalian, his ethnicity is Somalian and Saudi Arabian, he does not have relationships to anyone in either country, he is not familiar with the languages, and he has “no experience with the respective local cultures” (Rashid, 2018).

For Abdoul, Canada quickly became a place he came to regard as “home.” His family and his friends, along with everything and everyone he has ever known, are all based in Canada. In addition, Abdoul is a father to his Canadian-born daughter, and, for him, being able to be an active father who is physically there is one of the most important parts of living in Canada (Rashid, 2018). Building his entire life in this place and having such a strong connection and attachment to this country made the thought of being forcibly removed from his “home” as one of the most traumatic and unforeseeable events that he could imagine –one that he thought would never occur.

At the age of 24, nearly two decades since he first arrived in Canada, Abdoul's life in Canada was threatened and was about to change. In 2014, Abdoul received a sentence of approximately four and a half years after pleading guilty to assault charges (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018). Abdoul understood the sentence and completed his time while viewing the whole ordeal as a consequence he deserved and, on his part, "taking responsibility" for his actions (Barton, 2018, 03:18). He thought that, after serving his sentence, he would be given a second chance to "be a father to his daughter" and stay clear of the law (Barton, 2018, 03:40). After he served his time, right after he was released from prison, "he was immediately re-arrested by Canadian Boarder Services Agency (CBSA) due to his immigration status" (Williams, 2018a). This is when Abdoul became aware of his permanent resident status and began to understand what Bill C-43 ultimately meant for PRs like him who were sentenced to prison for a criminal offence.

Abdoul's criminal sentence "gave rise to inadmissibility proceedings under the IRPA" (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018), more specifically, Bill C-43, the *Faster Removal of Foreign Criminals Act*. Approximately 18 years after living in Canada, Abdoul was given a deportation order by the Canadian government that required him to go back to his country of origin, Somalia, immediately (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018). Abdoul was found "inadmissible to Canada" by the *Immigration and Refugee Protection Act* (IRPA) under s.36(1) which states,

A permanent resident or a foreign national is inadmissible on grounds of serious criminality for: (a) having been convicted in Canada of an offence under an Act of Parliament punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of at least 10 years, or of an offence under an Act of Parliament for which a term of imprisonment of more than six months has been imposed; (b) having been convicted of an offence outside Canada that, if committed in Canada, would constitute an offence under an Act of Parliament punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of at least 10 years; or (c) committing an act outside Canada that is an offence in the place where it was committed and that, if committed in Canada, would constitute an offence under an Act of Parliament punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of at least 10 years. (IRPA, 2001)

As noted by the Canadian Council for Refugees (CCR) (2013), “In June 2013, Parliament passed Bill C-43, the *Faster Removal of Foreign Criminals Act* which provided new rules under the IRPA. Under the new rules, the CCR (2013) explains that permanent residents (PRs) can be deported to the country they hold citizenship status with if they are sentenced to prison for a minimum of six months for committing a crime, or if they commit a crime outside of Canada, regardless of whether they are charged or not. In addition, “Bill C-43 bars access to the Immigration Appeal Division (IAD) for more permanent residents who have committed a crime” (CCRA, 2013). In other words, PRs who fall under this act will not be considered for any appeals, as there is currently no appeal process available.

When he first found out that the Canadian state was attempting to deport him, Abdoul immediately thought about the lack of connection, knowledge, relationships and memory of his birth country. Thinking back to when he first found out about his deportation order, he stated, “Honestly, I had a breakdown. I don’t remember my language, I don’t remember nothing, you know. I know nobody there” (Barton, 2018, 04:06). When asked why he did not get his Canadian citizenship status, Abdoul stated, “It was children aid (Children’s Aid Society), DCS (Department of Community Services), and their responsibilities as my guardians, and they neglected that. They just didn’t want to do what was needed to be done” (Barton, 2018, 02:35). The attempt to deport Abdoul to Somalia, a place he never lived but has been constructed and defined as his “home” by the Canadian state, reveals a number of social justice issues that will be explored in the first section of this paper.

Abdoul’s story inspired me to take on this research project that focuses specifically on the experiences of people who currently have a permanent resident status, yet spent almost the entirety of their lives in Canada. When I first heard about Abdoul’s case, I thought about how

traumatic it must be to be told that the place one has come to regard as “home” is not *actually* their home according to the state. I could not come to understand how one could face the risk of being forcibly removed and displaced from the place one calls “home” because for me, I define “home” as a place where I am safe, rooted, comfortable, and able to be my *true* self. To be stripped away from this is unjust.

I began to think about my friends who, like Abdoul, also immigrated to Canada at a very young age. “Home” for them meant the same as “home” for me –full of meaning and a part of our identities. The only difference was that my “home” was legitimized by the state and could not be taken from me. From here, feelings of frustration came over me as I questioned what the purpose was of granting people permanent residency if their immigration status did not actually mean that they were welcomed to stay in Canada permanently. While researching more about Bill C-43, I thought that it would be more accurate to call this status “part-time” or “conditional” residency under state rules as utilizing the term “permanent” has proven to be inaccurate and misleading based on Canadian immigration policy. It is here that I became critical of this Bill and the construction of an immigration status that allowed for people to genuinely experience, live, and feel a part of Canadian society, but at the same time, places residents in Canada in a vulnerable position where they can be deemed inadmissible in Canada under certain grounds, such as criminality.

While Abdoul’s story initially introduced me into the topics surrounding Bill C-43, it was the thoughts of my friends being displaced to an unfamiliar territory that ultimately led me to devote my MRP to this topic. They lived in Canada for almost as long as I did, and knowing that I enjoy unearned privileges based on birth rights that they do not was incomprehensible and extremely unfair in my view. I could not wrap my head around the fact that one can live, let’s

say, 98% of their lives in Canada, but could face the risk of deportation due to criminality. While I can live comfortably, knowing that Canada is my “home,” and that my life cannot be stripped from me through the practices of deportation, this is not the case for them. It is unjust to displace people who have built their entire lives in Canada just because they are not Canadian citizens. No one deserves to be punished, or face double-punishments, just because they are PRs. It is this anger, frustration and worry for people with PRs statuses who moved to Canada so young, just like my friends, who are threatened by the very existence of Bill C-43, that brought me to this research.

Overview of Research Topic

Bill C-43 was passed in 2013 by the federal government (CCR, 2013). The research question guiding my MRP is the following: What does Bill C-43 mean to those who have immigrated to Canada at a young age (i.e. under the age of 10) and have come to regard Canada as their “home” despite their precarious migration status? The focus of my MRP will revolve around questions regarding the concept of “home,” place, belonging and consciousness. This paper argues that Bill C-43, while operating as a tool of oppression on groups deemed the “other,” echoes the colonial logics of exclusion deriving from Indigenous and white settler relations in Canada. It is argued that Bill C-43 operates as a mechanism that has the potential to displace PRs who are constructed as “dangerous,” thus illustrating the intolerance for those perceived as “outsiders.” At the core, I am interested in Bill C-43’s impact of “home” and, relatedly, citizenship and identity for PRs. Additional sub-questions include:

- Can Bill C-43 be viewed as a law that operates as a tool of oppression?

- What is the impact of this policy in relation to consciousness and belonging (i.e. Do PRs, who have spent the majority of their lives in Canada, consciously view themselves as immigrants)?
- Do PRs, who immigrated to Canada at a young age, feel that they belong, socially and emotionally, in Canada and do not see themselves as different than Canadian citizens?

With Bill C-43 in place, the issue of being forcibly removed from the place one has come to regard as “home” and being sent back to one’s country of origin, which they have no living memory of and possibly no ongoing relations or connections to, can be studied within the broader social justice context. My MRP aims to advance knowledge in the social justice field specifically relating to place theory, racism, and Canadian immigration policy. Due to the time frame of this project, I was unable to conduct a full study of the experiences of PRs in Canada and provide an in-depth policy analysis on the implications of Bill C-43 on those who have suffered from it. Instead, I conducted a case study focusing on the experiences of two young people with permanent resident status who immigrated to Canada as a child (i.e. under 10 years old) and who were not in direct contact with Bill C-43. In the following pages, while highlighting the data regarding their understandings of place and “home” obtained from interviews with two PRs, Bill C-43 is utilized as a backdrop for my analysis. More specifically, the knowledge gathered from my research is applied to Bill C-43 while the focal point is geared towards the potential harm caused by this immigration policy, especially when considering PR’s understandings of place and “home,” as well as their social, emotional, and physical wellbeing.

To begin, I provide a literature review as it serves as the foundation for this paper. The rise of “White Canada” and the creation of the “other” through the colonialism of Indigenous

peoples in Canada is explored to provide a contextual understanding of the regulation of “insiders” and “outsiders.” Following this, I explore the intersections of crime, race and immigration which includes an examination of the concepts of “home” and belonging through Abdoul Abdi’s case. A section dedicated to place theory, the theoretical framework that guides this paper, follows this. Here, a discussion on “home,” “place,” and place attachment is presented. Throughout the literature review, Bill C-43, the descendant of Bill C-44 (which will be introduced below) is discussed and framed as a tool of oppression that operates through the colonial logics of exclusion. The methodology portion of this paper follows this where the research design of this project, as well as an explanation as to how case studies became my research strategy, is discussed. Here, I justify the use of case studies as a research design, as well as the use of “thick description” (Geertz, 1973). Next, I present the cases of Jay and Trevor¹, followed by a discussion on what “home” means, feelings of being Canadian despite one’s immigration status, and the uniqueness of settling in a diverse city. It will become evident that Bill C-43 operates as a tool of oppression in that it has the ability to legally redefine the concept of “home” for PRs while deeming their understandings as invalid. I will conclude this paper with a discussion on the implications of practice, policy, and research highlighting what *can* be done, what *should* be done, and ideas for further research on Bill C-43.

Literature Review

The rise of “White Canada” and the creation of the “other”

“...the Aryan races will not wholesomely amalgamate with the Africans or the Asiatics ...the cross of those races, like the cross of the dog and the fox, is not successful; it cannot be, and never will be.” (John A. Macdonald, as cited in Stanley, 2015).

¹ Pseudonyms were chosen by participants in this study.

This idea, that natives were waiting for Europeans to lead us to civilization, is just a variation on the old savagism versus civilization dichotomy, but it is a dichotomy that North America trusts without question. It is so powerful a toxin that it contaminates all of our major institutions.

—Thomas King, *The Inconvenient Indian*

Barnes (2009) states, “Deportation as exercise of sovereign power is concerned with the largely unchallenged right of states to remove foreigners who are not legally entitled to remain within their territories” (p. 432). As a sovereign state, Canada utilizes its right to remove and admit who they choose, while at their discretion. Canada initially obtained the power to decide who belongs and who is excluded during colonization and the construction of the “White Canada,” also referred to as “white settler society” (Anderson, Campbell & Belcourt, 2018, p. 67). Razack describes “white settler society” as the following,

A white settler society is one established by Europeans on non-European soil. Its origins lie in the dispossession and near extermination of Indigenous populations by the conquering Europeans. As it evolves, a white settler society continues to be structured by a racial hierarchy. In the national mythologies of such societies, it is believed that white people came first and it is they who principally developed the land; Aboriginal peoples are presumed to be mostly dead or assimilated. European settlers thus become the original inhabitants and the group most entitled to the fruits of citizenship. (as cited in Anderson, Campbell & Belcourt, 2018, p. 67)

Through this process, racist discourses and ideologies came into play where Indigenous peoples were labelled as “deviant, dysfunctional” and “subhuman” (Anderson, Campbell & Belcourt, 2018, p. 67). These racist ideologies worked to maintain “White Canada” as they continued to flow “through discourses of white settler supremacy and Indigenous inferiority” which were then “justified through manipulation of settler colonial law” (Anderson, Campbell, Belcourt, 2018, p. 71). This will be illustrated in the sections below.

How did Canada obtain the discretionary power to decide who is and is not permitted into the state? To understand this, one must refer back to the historical context of colonialism of Indigenous peoples in Canada. Borders were created during colonialism, and with the birth of

Canada as a nation came with it the affirmation of control over who is permitted into the territory and who is deemed “fit” enough to call themselves citizens. Stemming from colonialism with the intent to commit cultural genocide, “The principle of racial distinction and exclusion has been enshrined in Canada’s philosophy of nation building and continues to form the premise on which current immigration practices are based” (Barnes, 2009, p. 436). From the rise of the Canadian colonial state, the construction of “insiders” and “outsiders, “us” and “them” were created through racist ideology. Stuart Hall explains that this “othering” process “facilitates the ‘binding’ or bonding together of all of Us who are ‘normal’ into one ‘imagined community’; and it sends into symbolic exile of Them – ‘the Others’ –who are in some way different – ‘beyond the pale’” (as cited in Comack, 2012, p. 18). Henry et al (1998) name this process of “othering” as “the discourse of binary polarization” while explaining,

The fragmentation into “we” and “they” groups is usually framed in the context of an examination of the relative values and norms of the majority versus minority populations. “We” are the White dominant culture or the culture of organization (police, school, workplace); “they” are the communities who are the “other,” possessing “different” (undesirable) values, beliefs, and norms. “We” are law-abiding, hardworking, decent, and homogeneous. We are the “Canadian-Canadians” (Mackey, 1996), the “birthright Canadians” (Dabydeen, 1994). The “theys” are very different and therefore undeserving (Apple. 1993). (Henry et al, 1998, p. 28-29)

The territorial interests of the colonizers came with racist and sexist attitudes, constructing the narratives on the “savagery” of the “uncivilized” Indigenous “other” who was “inherently inferior and incapable of governing themselves,” thus in need of being regulated by the Western patriarchal order (Henry et al, 1998, p. 119). The Eurocentric laws and practices that followed focused on the displacement, assimilation, Christianization of Indigenous populations through violence and abuse (Henry et al, 2018, p. 123-140).

In order to understand the current issues within the Canadian immigration system, one must examine what occurred in the early days of nation-building of what we now know as

Canada. It is important to situate colonialism as “a living phenomenon” that continues today in less overt ways, where narratives of the “other” are reinforced and reapplied to additional marginalized groups, such as migrants (Monture, as cited in Comack, 2012, p. 66). The dominant and reinforced narrative on the settlement of Canada in North American history is that European explorers entered onto the territory, finding that it was “empty land” that was in need of conquering, and thus the European colonizers deemed the Indigenous people, the original people of the land, as “savages” with no “real” governed rules to abide by (Comack, 2012, p. 42). Indigenous cultural and traditional ways were ignored while the colonizers constructed Indigenous peoples as lawless and in need of “real” civilization. The colonizers denied Indigenous peoples their sovereignty and reduced them to “the status of children and wards of the state” (King, 2012, p. 82). The European colonizers attempted to transform the original people of Turtle Island into an inferior group, while at the same time they began nation-building the new, “legitimate,” “White Canada.” The treaties that were signed between the Indigenous people and the colonizers were not respected, and Indigenous peoples were expected “to abandon their ways, languages, spiritual and economic systems” in addition to their lands (Comack, 2012, p. 70).

In order to secure the colonialist agenda, the *Indian Act* was introduced in 1876, an act that “historically outlined every aspect of life for an Indigenous person in Canada,” and, as described by Talaga (2017), as “a form of apartheid, a piece of legislation designed to control and tame the Indigenous population” (p. 58). Through the *Indian Act*, the Canadian government attempted to destroy Indigenous beliefs, customs, and practices. Residential schools were enforced through this law, and described in parliament, by John A. Macdonald (1883), as the following,

When the school is on the reserve the child lives with its parents, who are savages; he is surrounded by savages, and though he may learn to read and write, his habits and training and mode of thought are Indian. He is simply a savage who can read and write. It has been strongly pressed on myself, as the head of the Department, that Indian children should be withdrawn as much as possible from the parental influence, and the only way to do that would be to put them in central training industrial schools where they will acquire the habits and modes of thought of white men. (Macdonald, as cited in Talaga, 2017, p. 60)

As evident in this passage, racist discourses that positioned and reinforced the white colonizers as the “dominant” group were used to marginalize Indigenous populations. The process of “othering” is apparent through this passage while the construction of whites as “us” and Indigenous people as “them” is clearly implied. The words of Macdonald illustrate the complete disregard of Indigenous rights as the first people of the land, while indirectly constructing Canada as the “home” for settlers where Indigenous thought, ways, and beliefs cannot be tolerated. The state completely excluded Indigenous people in the construction of Canada as a nation, “rendered them invisible” and enforced exclusionary powers that still continue today (Henry et al, 1998, p. 31). Indigenous people were constructed as “savages” who posed a threat to “White Canada.” In order for the next generation of Indigenous people (i.e. Indigenous children) to “absorb into Canadian society” and further legitimize the White state, racist discourses, laws, and policies were implemented and operated as a tool of oppression (Talaga, 2017, p. 60). The colonial logic of exclusion during colonialism was utilized to control and reduce Indigenous populations into subhuman while simultaneously establishing “White Canada.”

What does colonization have to do with Bill C-43 and understanding “home” and place for PRs? To fully view this policy through a social justice lens, it must be placed within the context of colonialism and argued that, to fully resist this Bill, it must be looked at as a mechanism that sustains and legitimizes the colonial state, more specifically, the colonial logics

of exclusion. The Canadian state relied on the destruction of Indigenous laws, cultures, ways, and even their existence in order to build the nation we now know as Canada. The colonialist agenda, which operates through inherently racist policies, practices, and discourses in attempt to reinforce the denial of Indigenous populations in terms of the past, present, and future, has been analyzed by Indigenous scholars as part of establishing “settler futurity” –the ensured continuation of settler colonialism (i.e. “the domination of Indigenous lands and peoples by non-Indigenous peoples”) and colonial relations in perpetuity (Anderson, Campbell & Belcourt, 2017, p. 67; Tuck & Fernandez, 2013). “Settler futurity” involves the “continued and complete eradication of the original inhabitants of contested land” and the maintenance and reinforcement of colonial logics appearing as the norm to the masses (Tuck & Fernandez, 2013, p. 80). While Indigenous peoples continue to resist this violence, the Canadian state continues to protect Canada as a nation, while reinforcing narratives of “insiders” and “outsiders” onto more groups who do not fit into Canada’s national identity, with migrant groups as an example.

While I argue that it is essential to refer to the history of the nation building of Canada and colonization in order to fully understand how Canada obtained its sovereign power to exclude, it is important to clearly indicate that the oppression and treatment of migrants in Canada is nowhere near the same magnitude of Indigenous suffering in North America. I do not want to risk conflating violence against Indigenous peoples and the continued denial of their existence with the oppression towards migrants. Instead, I argue that migrants face similar logics of exclusion that can be traced from colonial periods. I aim to illustrate that migrants are faced with harmful policies that illustrate the colonial logics of exclusion that continue to build on “White Canada” rhetoric.

Historically, migrants who were viewed as capable assimilating into “Canadian ways” were admitted, while those who were viewed as “unworthy” and incapable of conforming were denied. It was the racialized “others” who were constructed in this way, as it was believed that they would bring with them their foreign and “uncivilized” ways, which was incompatible with “White Canada” (Johnson, 2006, p. 40). For instance, white immigrants were encouraged to settle in Canada because they were “of superior stock,” while immigrants of colour were treated as “less desirable” (Comack, 2006, p. 96).

The expansion of “White Canada” continued until economic needs were not met by the “desirable” immigrants alone (Comack, 2006, p. 96). For instance, the first non-white immigrants were Chinese men (women and children were excluded) who were welcomed as an “attractive source of cheap labour” in 1881 when the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) needed to be built (Comack, 2006, p. 96). When the CPR was near completion, attitudes towards Chinese immigrants started to shift, with Prime Minister John A. McDonald stating that a Chinese person “was a sojourner in a strange land... and has no common interest with us” (as cited in Comack, 2006, p. 98). There was fear amongst “white working men” that the Chinese railway workers would take away jobs, and the reaction to this fear was the creation of a narrative where Chinese men were “out to seduce white women,” thus, a major threat that could not be tolerated (Johnson, 2006, p. 41). These narratives reproduced the idea of Chinese people as “others” who posed a danger to Canadian society (Johnson, 2006, p. 41). Anti-Chinese attitudes were common among Canadian-born communities and the pressure to restrict Chinese immigration increased (Johnson, 2006, p. 41). In 1885, the *Chinese Immigration Act* was put into effect which “imposed a head tax on all Chinese men arriving in Canada” (Comack, 2006, p. 98). Chinese immigrants, who were once viewed as great workers, served their purpose and were now viewed as an

“immigration problem” that needed regulation. The head tax was used as a deterrence for Chinese immigration with an aim to keep Chinese immigrants out of Canada. In 1923, the colonial logics of exclusion were echoed when the Canadian government prohibited *any* Chinese immigration in Canada (Johnson, 2006, p.41). Prejudice, discrimination and exclusion based on race was legitimized through law. This example of the changing attitudes towards Chinese immigration illustrates the construction of “insiders” and “outsiders” based on changing economic needs. Canada invited the Chinese to immigrate as a crucial economic source, however, once they were no longer needed, the Chinese were racialized and constructed as the “other” who were no longer welcome into the land.

The “othering” and racialization process deriving from the early days of colonialism continues today in more covert instances, however nonetheless proving the colonial logics of exclusion to be a pattern continuously repeated through several different systems, with law being the most obvious. The establishment of “settler futurity” is evident, where colonial logics continue to be passed down through systems, such as law, and engage in a process of “othering” while continuing to deny the past, present, and future of Indigenous populations. One of the first stages of obtaining control over the land was the exertion of power by the colonial state through the establishment of borders. The authority to “rule” and control these borders were then given to the Canadian government. As a result, Canadian citizenship was created, which included the “rules” on who belongs and does not belong (i.e. In order for Indigenous people to “belong” in the eyes of the colonial state, they would have to conform to the rules pertaining to Canadian citizenship). The colonial state reconstructed the meaning of “home” and “place” for Indigenous peoples through the creation of borders, the establishment of belonging on the land (i.e. through Canadian citizenship), and the restrictions on movement. Bill C-43 is an example of the colonial

logics of exclusion at work currently, where Canadian law, deriving from the denial of Indigenous treaties, marginalizes immigrants with PR status who are constructed as a threat to the state. Through this Bill, race, crime, and immigration status intersect and PRs who fall under this are constructed as intolerable “dangerous” criminal “others.” Before diving deeper into Bill C-43, I will first introduce Bill C-44, the predecessor of Bill C-43, as it paved the way for the exclusionary policies of immigrants based on criminality and introduced the “criminal foreigner.”

The reinforced narrative of the “other” & “dangerous criminal foreigner”

The Immigration Act of Canada was amended in 1995 with the introduction of Bill C-44, the “danger to the public” clause (Barnes, 2009, p. 432). The new changes “allowed for the deportation, without a right of appeal, of permanent residents deemed a “danger to the public” where defining “dangerousness” was “contingent upon a person being convicted of a criminal offense that could attract a sentence of 10 years or more” (Barnes, 2009, p. 432). Prior to Bill C-44, permanent residents had the right to appeal a deportation order before the Immigration Appeal Division (IAD), however, Bill C-44 took away this right while effectively igniting the moral panic surrounding “criminal immigrants” (Barnes, 2009, p. 435-436).

In *Securing Borders: Detention and Deportation in Canada*, Pratt (2005) states, “While criminality and security have each long been exclusionary immigration categories, in the 1990s crime-security emerged as *the* dominant governing rationale for exclusionary Canadian immigration law and policy” (p. 139). Pratt (2005) notes that the “legal construction and regulation of the “criminal foreigner” can be traced back to, as she calls, “a tough piece of legislation,” Bill C-44 of 1995 (p. 139). Bill C-44 is also known as the “Just Desserts” Bill,

named after a café in Toronto where a white woman was shot and killed in April of 1994 (Pratt, 2005, p. 440). The four black men who were charged with her killing were crucified in the media, which paid close attention to their immigration statuses as PRs who arrived in Canada as children (Pratt, 2005, p. 440). Just months after the “Just Desserts” murder, a white constable was shot and killed by a man born in Jamaica wanted under a deportation order (Pratt, 2005, p. 440). These events evoked a moral panic surrounding immigrants of colour, where media outlets and politicians called for tougher laws that would protect Canada from these “dangerous foreigners.”

As Pratt (2005) highlights, “These murders, coupled with already heightened tensions between the black community and the police, triggered a massive public panic around the issues of race, crime, and immigration, a panic that the government seized upon and responded to swiftly and on several different fronts” (p. 140). In 1995, Bill C-44 legally came into effect and “introduced the danger to the public provision (section 70[5]), which sanctioned deportation without appeal of any non-citizen deemed by the minister of citizenship and immigration to represent a danger to the public” (Pratt, 2005, p. 140). This was the first piece of legislation that allowed for the deportation of PRs under criminal grounds. The narrative of the coloured “criminal other” who was “undeserving” and “too dangerous” to continue residing in Canada was constructed, while the idea of immigrants as “outsiders” continued to be reinforced, thus echoing the colonial logics of exclusion. The enactment of Bill C-44 in combination with the media coverage of Caribbean-born criminal immigrants in Canada further intensified the moral panic surrounding the “dark” and “dangerous” criminal “other.”

While Bill C-44 has been amended, today we are still faced with the risk of deportation for non-citizens based on criminality under Bill C-43, a Bill almost identical to Bill C-44 (Pratt,

2005, p. 141). In the post 9/11 era, the security and safety of the nation is deemed a priority while the law, as Bill Ong Hing (2006) puts it, “does not afford long-time residents with a second chance” (p. 54). In *Deporting Our Souls*, Hing (2006) argues that policies like Bill C-44 and Bill C-43 are “policies that are unnecessarily harsh –that show a dehumanizing side of our character –are senseless” (p. 7). After 9/11, several changes have been made to the IRPA with national security as its justification in the fight against suspected terrorists (Chan & Chunn, 2014, p. 120). It is not surprising that the Canadian state focused on amendments to immigration law because, as Roach (2005) argues, this “allows for procedural shortcuts and a degree of secrecy that would not be tolerated under even an expanded criminal law” (as cited in Chan & Chunn, 2014, p. 121). It is those who fit the narrative of the “dangerous criminal alien” (i.e. immigrants of colour who are primary targets in both the criminal justice system and in immigration law) that are most threatened by Bill C-43. The construction of the “dangerous criminal alien” and the link between race, crime and immigration will be explored in the section below.

The Construction of the “Dangerous Criminal Alien:” The racialization of crime with relation to immigration in Canada

In *Crime, Deportation and the Regulation of Immigrants in Canada*, Wendy Chan (2005) argues that the admission, restriction, and expulsion within Canadian borders are “not just administrative decisions, but also deeply political ones” (p. 154). Her study, focusing on the deportation of criminally convicted immigrants from Canada, involved an examination of the Immigration and Refugee Board which found that commentary made by the Canadian State in the Appeal Division of deportations included the following: “appellants from non-white countries are less likely to rehabilitate themselves, more likely to be described as coming from

dysfunctional families, more likely to be regarded of being at risk for re-offending, less deserving of compassion, and more likely to be described as an “undesirable” person not worthy of being allowed to stay in Canada” (Chan, 2005, p. 162, 166). She found, “Whereas in cases involving appellants from Anglo-European countries, the reasons for dismissing the appeal focuses less on the above factors and more on the crimes committed or legal issues concerning why the individuals cannot stay” (Chan, 2005, p. 166). These racist discourses currently at play within the Canadian immigration system show the colonial logics of exclusion at work through the continuous processes of “othering” and implementation of exclusionary and discriminatory policies and practices. Through the process of “othering,” the constructions of the “good” and “bad” immigrant are created. The ‘good’ immigrant has white skin, conforms, agrees and/or believes in ideologies of the West, is capable of understanding what was done wrong and is deserving of a second chance (Chan, 2005, p. 166). The ‘bad’ immigrant has coloured skin, has ‘savage’ tendencies stemming from the cultural traditions of their home country, is not remorseful, is not capable of change, does not deserve a second chance, and is a dangerous individual who does not belong on Canadian soil, let alone represent Canada as a nation.

In *Racialization, Crime, and Criminal Justice in Canada*, Wendy Chan and Dorothy Chunn (2014) discuss the racialization of national security arguing that there has been a shift regarding immigration reform, once focused on “building citizenship and importing economic capital,” is now concerned with providing “protections” for the state on issues involving “law and order and security” (p. 121). With the focus now on national security and combating terrorism, those whose “race, ethnicity and religion that are incompatible with Western values and traditions” are now viewed as “suspect” and as a threat (Chan & Chunn, 2014, p. 123). For instance, Arab and Muslim Communities, who were once viewed as “peace-loving, contributing

citizens and residents” prior to 9/11, are now viewed as the “new enemy” of the state (Chan & Chunn, 2014, p. 123). The line between “us” and “them” has thickened and expelling those constructed as “others” from the state has been argued to be a necessary practice in order to protect the state.

With the growing line between “us” and “them,” the construction of the “desirable” and “undesirable” immigrant continues to intensify (Chan & Chunn, 2014, p. 134). As Chan & Chunn (2014) argue, “Social characteristics such as race, class, and citizenship are the key markers used by states to differentiate between these two groups” which has been “instrumental in legitimizing punitive immigration policies and practices, aimed at excluding those who do not belong” (p. 134). On top of this, the added characteristic of “criminal” further pushes immigrants into the “unworthy” and “undeserving” category. This is where intersection of criminal law and immigration law become apparent. In *The Social Construction of the Criminal Alien*, Warner (2005) notes, “Social constriction of immigrants as “criminal aliens” is increasing due to what Kanstroom (2000) has called the ‘criminalization of immigration,’ which involves the unification of social control of both immigrants and criminals through integration of deportation with criminal justice system operation” (p. 57). As a result, the person of colour, who does not have Canadian citizenship and has been in trouble with the law, is now believed to be the “dangerous outsider” “who threatens the moral stability and security of society” (Barnes, 2009, p. 434). In the eyes of the Canadian state, these people “do not belong” and are not “entitled to the territorial benefits bestowed by citizenship” (Barnes, 2009, p. 434). Bill C-43 is a mechanism echoing the colonial logics of exclusion where narratives of race, criminality, and immigration status are linked to ideas of the “unworthy dangerous other” who does not deserve to be, let alone belong, in Canadian society.

“Home,” Belonging & the Harm of Forced Dislocation: Abdoul Abdi’s Case

Under Bill C-43, not only do PRs complete their criminal sentence, they also face a deportation order post-jail resulting in a “double sentence.” While facing a double consequence is severely life changing, for PRs who immigrated to Canada at as a youth, the punishment of deportation has a horrific impact, one that cannot be compared with jail time. In his discussion on the deportation of PRs from the state versus solely serving a criminal sentence, Hing (2006) argues that “deportation is clearly more detrimental to the life of a noncitizen than the imposition of a criminal sentence. Yet the courts continue to treat immigration proceedings as civil proceedings, failing to view deportation as a separate and additional punishment” (p. 55). Following this logic, the deportation of PRs who immigrated to Canada as a child is, in and of itself, a life-altering sentence. He adds, “A deported noncitizen faces the possibility of losing his or her family, friends, and livelihood forever. Many deported noncitizens are cast to countries with which they virtually have no ties” (Hing, 2006, p. 55). Through Abdoul Abdi’s case, the harmful impact of deportation, especially on PRs who immigrated to Canada as a youth, will be explored.

Born on September 17, 1993 in Saudi Arabia, Abdoul spent his first two years living in his birth country until he, along with his mother, sister and two aunts, were recognized as refugees by the United Nations and moved into a United Nations Refugee Camp in Djibouti, a country bordered by Somalia, Ethiopia and Eritrea (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018; World Atlas, 2017). While Abdoul’s biological father was of Saudi Arabian descent, his mother originated from Somalia and raised him on her own (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018). Despite his birth country being Saudi Arabia, Abdoul never obtained Saudi Citizenship due to the fact that “Saudi Arabia does not grant citizenship on the basis of birth on Saudi soil” (Macklin & Mandhane, 2012). Instead,

Abdoul inherited his mother's Somali citizenship (Macklin & Mandhane, 2012). After living in Saudi Arabia for two years, Abdoul and his family went directly to the refugee camp in Djibouti, meaning that he never actually lived or stepped foot on Somali soil despite holding Somali citizenship. During the four years that Abdoul and his family lived at the refugee camp, his mother passed away and his aunts took care of him and his sister (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018).

Abdoul, his sister, and two aunts left the refugee camp in Djibouti when they became sponsored refugees, and, shortly after, arrived in Nova Scotia, Canada in August of 2000 (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018). Just one year after arriving in Canada, Abdoul and his sister, Fatuma, were taken away from his aunts by the Nova Scotia Department of Community Services (DCS) for reasons that still remain unclear (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018). Beginning in 2002, Abdoul spent his entire childhood in the responsibility and control of DCS (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018). As noted in the official court documents, "During his time in the care of DCS, Mr. Abdi was placed in 31 different foster homes. Grade 6 was the highest level of education he obtained. By the age of 13, he started getting into trouble with the law and spent time in a number of group homes in various cities. Over time, he compiled a youth criminal record" (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018). When asked about her and her brother's experience with DCS, Fatuma explained, "He got passed around more times than I could count. We went through mental and physical abuse. There was no help ever given, nothing. There was no therapy given to my brother and he was just chucked around like a piece of animal, like animals don't even get treated like that, you know what I mean. So how are you going to treat a human being, a little boy, like that?" (Pace, 2018, 00:34). Fatuma described her experience in foster care as "like being in solitary confinement" and shared that "the reason why she and Abdoul do not speak Somali is because when they would speak to each

other in their language, the workers would put them on time out and isolate them in their rooms, accusing them of plotting together to escape” (Jones, 2018).

While court documents on Abdoul and his sister’s custody case state that the reasons for them being taken into the care of the state was never fully explained, writer Asaf Rashid (2018) argues that “the justification for this apprehension is somewhat mysterious, but typical in cases of black and Indigenous children, where there is greater scrutiny on parenting, and children are often taken into the care of the state.” DCS officially obtained permanent care and custody of Abdoul and Fatuma in 2003 (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018). Despite being in the hands of DCS, Abdoul’s aunt attempted to apply for his citizenship on his behalf in 2005 when he was 12 years old. However, she was unsuccessful as the DCS argued that only they could apply for Abdoul’s citizenship and that she was in no position to intervene (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018). The argument put forth by DCS was favoured by the court, reminding Abdoul’s aunt that she had no jurisdiction over Abdoul’s destiny. Abdoul’s aunt made an attempt to gain permanent custody of him in 2008, and in her application to the courts, she highlighted her concern with Abdoul’s static PR status and the importance of him gaining citizenship status, however, the court denied her requests and left Abdoul’s fate in the hands of the state (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018).

As mentioned previously, Abdoul was charged and sentenced to jail for crimes that he pled guilty to. After serving his sentence, he had hoped that he could start his life over and learn from his mistakes, however, this was not the case. Immediately after he was released, he was rearrested and detained by Canadian immigration officials. As stated by family friend and activist, El Jones, “He paid for his own mistakes, which he had to. He paid in a prison sentence, but he is paying for everyone else’s mistakes as well, and I don’t think that’s fair. Meanwhile, our government has not been held accountable in any way to what has happened” (as cited in

Pace, 2018, 01:20). Similarly, Abdoul's sister Fatuma stated, "I think that it is really unfair that now that he's done his time for his crime, that they are trying to further punish him for something that the government failed to do" (Pace, 2018, 01:05).

While court documents show that Abdoul's social worker "provided external legal counsel with the information to process his citizenship application" in July of 2011, this occurred 11 years after he arrived in Canada, when he had already obtained a youth criminal record (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018). In May of 2013, when he was 19 years old, Abdoul was notified that, due to his criminal record, he did not fit the criteria to obtain citizenship (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018). Abdoul's lawyer, Benjamin Perryman, argued that if child services had taken appropriate action regarding Abdoul's citizenship application within his first few years of living in Canada, deportation to a country he never actually lived in would not apply (Williams, 2018a). Because the social workers responsible for his case waited several years later where he already obtained a criminal record, he was ineligible for Canadian citizenship. Due to this, Abdoul faced the risk of being deported to Somalia, "one of the most dangerous countries on Earth," a place constructed and defined as his "home" by the Canadian state, ignoring the fact that he had never actually been there before (Muscati & Macklin, 2018).

Abdoul's story illustrates several issues involving children being in state care, however, due to the scope of this paper, the issue of his deportation order from a place he came to regard as "home" will be the main focus of this discussion. Abdoul understood that he made mistakes and violated the law, thus being held accountable for his actions was not his concern (Williams, 2018a). What he wanted was to "face the same punishment as a Canadian with a similar record" (Williams, 2018a). As someone who lived in Canada for the majority of his life, who made a life for himself and has a family in Canada, why was he treated like someone who has no connection

to Canada? According to Abdoul, he is more Canadian than he is Somalian, and to be painted and treated as a foreign “other” is unjust and lacks logic when considering the construction of his identity. In other words, the person that he has become derived from his experiences in Canada.

In *Children, Place and Identity: Nation and Locality in Middle School*, Scourfield et al (2006) argue that “it has been long recognized that a person’s identification with nation begins to take root in childhood. Childhood experience is commonly taken to be the bedrock upon which self-identity is built, and national consciousness is regarded by many as a key foundation of a modern person’s identity” (p. 1). Social anthropologist, Ernst Gellner, argued that “the culture in which one has been *taught* to communicate becomes the core of one’s identity” (as cited in Scourfield et al, 2006, p. 1). With regard to national identity, that is, where one feels like they belong to, the identity building process are “explicit projects of the state” (Scourfield et al, 2006, p. 40). To file a deportation order to expel Abdoul from Canada based on criminality is implying that his mistakes are not only a threat to Canada as a nation, but also that it is justifiable to send him to Somalia because he is “dangerous” and that being “dangerous” is a characteristic of the people of Somalia. In other words, the Canadian state is reinforcing the narrative of the racialized “other” as “dangerous” while distinguishing Canada from Somalia, thus continuing to utilize the colonial logics of exclusion. In this narrative, Canada is under threat by foreigners from countries like Somalia, while Somalia is painted as a nation that is “dangerous,” thus, sending a criminal to this country is justified.

Frustrated with how the government was characterizing her brother, Fatuma, Abdoul’s sister, stated, “People don’t understand the story... and what I mean by that is I think people just think that he came as ...an adult or something, and that he came here just to break the law, and now that he broke the law, and he’s looking at going back to Somalia, that he is basically crying

for help ...but that is not how it is” (Pace, 2018, 00:01). Here, the significance of age is highlighted. When Abdoul was asked what he thought his status was prior to the deportation order, he replied, “To be honest, I thought I was just like everybody else. One hundred percent, I thought I was just like everyone else. I was trying to live my life. I didn’t know I was a refugee. I didn’t know nothing like that. I thought that I landed in this country, and I thought I was a Canadian just like any other kid” (Barton, 2018, 02:13). Growing up and living his life in Canada, Abdoul did not view himself as different than the people he interacted with. He lacked legal consciousness regarding his immigration status, which explained why he truly felt like he belonged in Canada. Being faced with a deportation order, his entire life, all his relationships, and the person he has become was about to be stripped from him. Who Abdoul became was not due to him being Somalian, but rather it was based on his experiences as a refugee, as a child under the custody of the state, as an individual who faced significant instances of trauma and violence, and as a person who made a mistake and became involved in the criminal justice system.

During Abdoul’s initial hearing, the government argued that it was ultimately Abdoul’s responsibility to understand immigration law and that his lack of memory or knowledge about his family is not a sign of trauma, but rather evidence of him willfully lying to agents” (Jones, 2018). In the eyes of the state, Abdoul was not viewed as a victim of child abuse and trauma, but rather a lying “dangerous foreign criminal” who should have done his research and applied for citizenship himself. Canada argued that it was his own fault for being in the position that he was in. Revisiting the significance of age, the government was Abdoul’s legal guardian for essentially the entirety of his childhood in Canada. Just as a parent protects their child, the government’s role was to protect Abdoul, which, in this case, would have meant applying for his

citizenship on his behalf in the first few years of his arrival to Canada. The government's argument that Abdoul should have taken onus on his legal immigration status and completed an application himself places blame on the child. How could the government expect Abdoul to understand the significance of citizenship in securing his right to place as a child? Arguing that Abdoul, as a child under the custody of the state, should have "known" better was a tactic used by the state to remove itself from its failed legal obligations in following the rules pertaining to the "best interest of the child." In the end, while the state had control over the destiny of Abdoul's life, it was negligent in ensuring protection for his rights as a child.

There were a number of preliminary hearings regarding Abdoul's case while attempting to move towards the actual deportation hearing. On July 13, 2018, Perryman argued that Abdoul's rights under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms were being infringed upon, and that Canada did not respect its international law obligations (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018; Canadian Charter, 1982). The judge in the hearing, Justice McDonald, agreed and granted a judicial review due to the "absence of any reference to the Charter" by the MD (*Abdi v. Canada*, 2018). Justice McDonald's ruling "set aside the decision to deport Abdoul, and sent the matter back to a different delegate of the Minister of Public Safety for 'redetermination'" (Bousquet, 2018).

On July 17, 2018, less than one week later after Justice McDonald's ruling, Abdoul found out that he would not be deported via a tweet from Public Safety Minister Ralph Goodale (2016) stating that "the government respects the decision filed on July 13 by the Federal Court." This meant that the government would no longer attempt to deport Abdoul. This decision, that held the fate of Abdoul's entire life in its hands, was not addressed formally through a media conference or formal announcement, but rather, through a tweet on Twitter. With Abdoul's life at stake, this action illustrated the government's lack of basic respect and care for his life. This

decision, that was extremely detrimental to this man's life, was not given the platform and explanation it deserved.

“Us” vs “Them”: Who belongs?

Abdoul's experience illustrated how PRs can truly feel like they belong in a country or place, regardless of their legal immigration status. In *Our Search for Belonging: How our need to connect is tearing us apart*, Howard J. Ross & Jonrobert Tartaglione (2018) explore the following question: “How does the inherent need to belong impact us as human beings?” (p. 7). As humans, it is our natural instinct to feel comfortable when we are in places and/or settings that we belong to. Ross & Tartaglione (2018) highlight that the feeling of belonging creates a kind of bond that has us feeling safer and knowing what to expect, what is considered normal and how to relate" (p. 7). This can explain the shock, confusion, and betrayal Abodul faced when he heard that the Canadian government was trying to deport him. Canada was considered to be his “home,” a place he felt like he belonged to and that he felt safe in. His case showed that when one has a precarious migration status, those feelings, relationships, and connections can be deemed invalid and ignored by the state when criminality becomes a factor.

Ross & Tartaglione (2018) argue that all humans have a need to fit in, in some way or another, that “belonging is an inherent survival mechanism” and that “there may be no greater need than the need to belong” (p. 8). What exactly does it mean to belong? By definition, belonging is a “close or intimate relationship” (Ross & Tartaglione, 2018, p. 27). For Ross & Tartaglione (2018), belonging has 5 key characteristics:

...a sense of shared identity, in that we see people in the groups we belong to as “us”; a shared destiny: the belief that what happens to you might also happen to me; a sense of interdependence, in that we rely on each other in some way, either directly or indirectly; a general sense of shared values: we may not agree on everything, but we generally share

a set of overall values that connects us; an ability for people to feel fully able to be themselves. (Tartaglione, 2018, p. 27)

Under this criteria, Abdoul was correct to assume that he belonged in Canada. To be forcibly removed from a place one feels they belong to has significant consequences that forces the individual to reevaluate their identity, or how it has been developed. Akesson (2015) argues that “dislocation from place may affect one emotionally, thereby altering various aspects of one’s identity, particularly those aspects that place supported such as one’s national identity” (p. 35). If where one has lived their whole life affects who they are, how does the deportation of PRs who have immigrated to Canada as a child impact one’s identity? Many PRs who immigrated to Canada in their early years consider their national identity to be Canadian while viewing their country of origin as a foreign place, which I have illustrated in this re-telling of Abdoul’s story. Massey (1991) argues that “a ‘sense of place’, of rootedness, can provide - in this form and on this interpretation - stability and a source of un-problematical identity” (p. 26). When this “sense of place” is taken away, there is significant harm done. With deportation as a specific example, Edward Said, as explained by Sampson & Gifford (2010), describes exile as the “unhealable rift forced between a human being and a native place, between the self and its true home: it’s essential sadness can never be surmounted” (p. 117). In this view, the deportation of PRs who have no living memory or relationship to their country of origin can be viewed as one of the greatest injustices committed.

Theoretical Approach

In this research, place theory will be utilized as the broader theoretical framework that will guide my MRP. The key concepts that will be explored below include “home,” “place,” place attachment, and place identity. The existing knowledge on these concepts will provide a strong foundation for exploring questions surrounding PRs experiences and understandings of

belonging and exclusion in Canada. In addition, place theory as a theoretical framework provides a strong basis for an examination on how Bill C-43 challenges these understandings. When taken together, these concepts help to address questions on how the legal system appears as neutral while the practices involved are justified in the name of “national security,” but in reality, operates as a tool of oppression that further marginalizes those deemed as “others” and “outsiders” located in Canadian territory.

Understanding “Home”

How can one understand “home” as a place when it comes to PRs? “Home” is a complex term with several meanings and interpretations. While the concept of “home” can be used literally, it can also be used metaphorically to signify different meanings (Manzo, 2003, p. 49). Akesson, Basso, & Denov (2016) discuss the distinction between the term “house” and “home.” They note, “‘House’ implies a built structure, whereas ‘home’ implies something deeper and more meaningful. A house becomes a home only when deeper meanings, feelings and symbolic values are attached to the structure” (Akesson, Basso, & Denov, 2016, p. 370). When researching about the experiences of PRs, depending on which age group I am focusing on, the meaning of “home” varies. For instance, if a PR who immigrated to Canada in their late 40’s is asked about the meaning of “home,” they may describe their birth country or country they lived for the longest period of time. When asking a PR who immigrated to Canada at the age of five, it can be expected that the understanding of “home” will shift. For instance, in Abdoul’s case, “home” meant Canada. It is evident that “home” means something much deeper than just the physical location –it is a combination of things, connections, emotions, and relations.

In his discussion on place as “home,” Cresswell (2004) argues that “home is an exemplary kind of place where people feel a sense of attachment and rootedness. Home, more than anywhere else, is seen as the centre of meaning and a field of care” (p. 24). In addition, “Home can be thought of in spatial and non-spatial terms, and refer to sets of relational ties and sentiments shared by individuals and social groups such as families, kinship networks and communities” (Perkins & Thorns, 2012, p. 74). However, “home” is not wholly imagined, but is also linked to physical surroundings. In *Place, Identity & Everyday Life in a Globalized World*, Perkins & Thorns (2012) argue that “we all live somewhere, and a place to live allows us to connect with people, the wider community and natural environment, and for many of the world’s people, their livelihood” (p. 74).

Understanding “Place”

“Place” is a term often used in everyday English language that can be used in a variety of ways. Two common examples where the term place is used includes referring to specific locations with coordinates, and certain positions or arrangements in relationships (i.e. one’s “place” in another’s life, one’s “place” at work, etc.). While the term is often used quite loosely, what does it truly mean? In *Place: A short introduction*, Tim Cresswell (2004) breaks down the concept of “place” stating, “What makes them places and not simply a room, a garden, a town, a world city, a new nation and an inhabited planet? One answer is that they are all spaces which people have made meaningful. They are all spaces people are attached to in one way or another. This is the most straightforward and common definition of place –a meaningful location” (p. 7). For example, Canada was not just a country for Abdoul, but rather a *place*. He made meaningful

connections with different people and different things. For him, Canada was a place full of meaning, which made the risk of deportation even harder to comprehend.

“Place” is not a straight forward concept. Like “home,” it is extremely complex and can mean many different things at different times. For Dixon & Durrheim (2000), places are “dynamic arenas that are both socially constituted and constitutive of the social” (p. 27). In Bree Akesson’s (2015) article, *Trees, flowers, prisons, flags: Frustration and hope shaping national identity for Palestinian families*, Cresswell’s (2004) work on place is discussed further. As paraphrased by Akesson (2015), “Place is both simple and complicated, familiar and unfamiliar, full of meaning and without meaning” (p. 35). Akesson (2015) argues that, based on Cresswell’s points, it is individuals who can make place meaningful where they can “become attached to certain places in a variety of ways” (p. 35). In other words, Canada is meaningful for Abdoul because he made it meaningful through his experiences, feelings and everyday living in the space. Additionally, Denov & Akesson call upon Casey (1997) in describing the concept of place. Casey notes that “place cannot be conceptualized as having a fixed or single meaning, essence, or structure. Rather, place is dynamic and changing” (as cited in Denov & Akesson, 2013, p. 370). For instance, Canada, in the broader sense, is a meaningful place for Abdoul; but Ontario specifically is not. For him, Nova Scotia is a meaningful place because that is where Canada became meaningful for him. It is it clear that place “is above all a territory of meaning” (Denov & Akesson, 2013, p. 370).

If “place” is a meaningful location, what exactly constitutes a meaningful location? John Agnew, a political geographer, argues that there are three primary characteristics that re-occur, which, in turn, constitute place as a meaningful location (Agnew & Livingstone, 2011, p. 327). *Location* is the first dimension of place (Agnew & Livingstone, 2011, p. 327). More specifically,

the “fixed objective co-ordinates on the earth’s surface” or *where* the place is physically (Cresswell, 2004, p. 7). Cities, neighbourhoods, countries, etc., fit into the first dimension of place. The second fundamental aspect of place is *locale*. Agnew describes place as “a series of locales or settings where everyday life activities take place” (Agnew & Livingstone, 2011, p. 327). Cresswell (2004) explains *locales* as “the actual shape of place within which people conduct their lives as individuals, men or women, as white, black, straight, gay” (p. 7). The final dimension of place is “*sense of place* or identification with place as a unique community, landscape, and moral order” (Agnew & Livingstone, 2011, p. 328). This refers to “the subjective and emotional attachment people have to place” (Cresswell, 2004, p. 7). It can be the feeling or knowing of “what it’s like to be there” (Cresswell, 2004, p. 7).

Cresswell (2004) cautions his readers that “place is not just a thing in the world but a way of understanding the world. Place is a way of seeing, knowing, and understanding the world. When we look at the world as a world of places we see different things. We see attachments and connections between people and place. We see worlds of meaning and experience” (p. 11). With PRs who immigrated to Canada as a youth, what or how does place look like? For instance, for one who immigrated to Canada at the age of two, how does one perceive the place they were born versus where they have been living for the majority of their life? Does Canada, the place they essentially grew up in, impact how they see, know and/or understand the world? Are they attached to their birth country? Are they attached to Canada? Do they or do they not have connections to these two different places? These questions illustrate how place theory can be used as an effective tool to understand the experiences of PRs who immigrated to Canada as a youth.

Place Attachment

To be rooted is the most important and least recognized need of the human soul.

-Simone Weil (as cited in Lewicka, 2014, p.50).

While “place” refers to spaces full of meaning for individuals, place attachment focuses primarily on the individual’s relationship that has been built with the specific place. Depending on the context, the meaning of “place” changes and can mean different things to different individuals. Place attachment, on the other hand, works with “place” in that places become meaningful when one builds an attachment and relationship to it. In its simplest form, place attachment is defined as “the emotional bonds between people and a particular place and environment” (Seamon, 2014, p. 11). In *In Search of Roots*, Lewicka (2014) argues that the concept of place attachment suggests “anchoring of emotions in the object of attachment, feeling of belonging, willingness to stay close, and wish to return when away” (p. 49). In many ways, place attachment can mean the feelings of being rooted and feeling comfortable. For me, being attached to a place means that a part of me is in the place, while a part of that place is always with me. I feel rooted in that place. When I am attached to a place, I find myself longing to go back when I am away. One may understand a place they are attached as a “*safe haven* where one can retreat from threats, problem-solve, and gain emotional relief” (Scannell & Gifford, 2014, p. 26).

For PRs who immigrated to Canada at a very young age, the attachment they have to the place they have come to regard as “home” (i.e. Canada) is unique. While their legal immigration status defines “home” as their birth country, their understanding of “home” is unique and can mean something or somewhere else. Can one be attached to both the place they were born and the place they live in? Can one find themselves missing feelings of attachment to the place they were born, while completely feeling attached to the place they moved to? Is it possible to be

stuck in-between, where one does not feel truly attached to any place specifically? How can the level of these attachments be understood and evaluated? How does one measure how attached one is to a specific place? The complexities of “home,” “place” and place attachment is extremely complex for this demographic.

As Lewicka (2014) highlights, attachment to place has frequently been diagnosed by looking at one’s desire to remain in the place overtime (p. 49). For instance, the more one wants to, and continues to be in a place, the more attached they appear to be. When attempting to measure how attached one is to a place, Lewicka (2014) notes that, historically, the first measure that a researcher looks at is how long one resided in a specific place (p. 49). There was a common assumption amongst researchers that “attached people stay longer in a place than those who are unattached” (Lewicka, 2014, p. 49). While this claim is often true in many circumstances, the length of residency cannot be viewed as the most accurate measure, especially in an age of mobility. For instance, a refugee might have a significantly strong attachment to their country of origin, yet they are forced to flee. They may spend the majority of their lives in the place they found refuge in, and still have a strong attachment to the country they had to leave. While the length of residency is a “predictor of place attachment,” it is not the sole, “direct measure” (Lewicka, 2014, p. 49). For instance, one’s experience can be used to understand their level of attachment to place. If one solely focuses on the length of residency to directly measure place attachment for a PR who moved to Canada at the age of nine and is now eighteen years old, the evaluation would be that the individual *should* be attached to their birth country because they lived there longer. However, what if the individual’s experience and memory of their birth country is traumatic and negative? Although they lived there for a longer period of time, they

may not feel attachments to that country due to their unique experience. In other words, one must consider additional factors when trying to understand an individual's attachment to place.

Taking the consequences of Bill C-43 into account, this immigration policy poses a threat to PRs "safe havens." In his chapter on place attachment with respect to mobility, Per Gustafson (2014) notes that, traditionally, place attachment is often studied by looking at the "emotional bonds with the current home place" (p. 40). He cautions that, when researching about place attachment and immigrants, mobility must be taken into account because the common assumption is that immigrants have "double or multiple belongings and combine new and old attachment to places with transnational ties" (Gustafson, 2014, p. 40). It is for this reason that I chose to focus my MRP specifically on those who immigrated to Canada at a very young age. For this demographic, having attachments to multiple places is unlikely due to the lack of living memory of their birth country. Framing my MRP around place theory as a methodological approach is useful because it provides a foundation for which an understanding of the impact of Bill C-43 (i.e. deportation of PRs from Canada) for those who call Canada their "home" is possible.

Place Identity

Place identity, a term coined by Proshansky (1983), can be described as "a pot-pourri of memories, conceptions, interpretations, ideas and related feelings about specific physical settings as well as types of settings" (p. 28). It is "a cognitive mechanism, a component of self-concept and/or of personal identity in relation to the place one belongs to" (Lewicka, 2014, p. 67). Lewicka (2014) argues that "place identity is based on our symbolic dependence on a place, the extent to which it serves a meaning-making function about who we are. Place identity is related

to negative attitudes to environmental change and their evaluation as disturbance” (p.67). For instance, if a PR is served a deportation order under Bill C-43 and cannot imagine moving to any other country other than Canada, what does that say about their place identity?

The concept of belonging is an essential basis for place-identity (Dixon & Durrheim, 2000, p. 29). In *Displacing place-identity: A discursive approach to locating self and other*, Dixon & Durrheim (2000) argue that questions involve “who we are” are ultimately related to questions of “where are we” (p. 27). In other words, place plays a significant role in the production of the self and identity. In addition, Bonaiuto et al (1996) state “the interpretation of the self would use environmental meanings to symbolize or situate individual identity. Thus, one’s identity can be partly formed, maintained and transformed in relation to features and uses of everyday environment(s)” (as cited in Lewicka, 2014, p. 67).

In *Place Attachment and Phenomenology: The Synergistic Dynamism of Place*, David Seamon (2014) argues that, through a phenomenological lens, place identity “phenomenologically relates to the process whereby people living in or otherwise associated with a place take up that place as a significant part of their world. One unselfconsciously and self-consciously accepts and recognizes the place as integral to his or her personal and communal identity and self-worth” (p. 17). If place is an essential component of the production of the self and identity, what does this mean for PRs who immigrated to Canada at a very young age? With regard to identity, Akesson (2015) notes, “It is not the place per se that contributes to identity, but rather the practices and the production of identity within those places. Children’s identity is always spatialized, and place —including its related stories and symbols— remains a critical site and vehicle for children’s construction of identity” (p. 36). Lewicka (2014) builds on this notion arguing that “place related memories, particularly those that concern childhood places, are an

important source of personal identity and continuity (p. 53). For PRs who immigrated to Canada as an infant or youth, Canada is a place that provided an environment for them to grow up and construct/produce who they are. It is the activities that occurred in that place and space that are significant. With this in mind, can the production of the identities of PRs be attributed to their lived-experiences in Canada, and, if so, what does this mean when thinking about the implications of Bill C-43?

In her discussion on the theoretical perspectives of the myth of the criminal character of immigrants, Annmarie Barnes (2009) states that “importation models” have commonly been used to explain immigrant criminality (p. 233). She notes that these importation models “focus on the social and cultural influences of an individual’s place of birth/origin as the primary explanation for immigrant criminality” (Barnes, 2009, p. 433). This model “emphasizes immigrant behavior as a function of past social networking and cultural background prior to migration” (Barnes, 2009, p. 433). If one’s place of birth has been used to explain their criminality, what does this mean for those who immigrated to Canada as a child, a time when their identities were just beginning to be produced? Building on Akesson’s ideas surrounding the production of identity, the argument that the criminal behaviour of a PR, who moved to Canada as a youth, can be explained by and reverts back to the social and cultural influences of the place in which they were born appears as a highly invalid, contradictory and as an unreasonable argument. For instance, for this demographic, who they are and who they have become has been produced within Canada. How could the criminality of one, who moved from their birth country at an extremely early stage in their lives, be linked to the constructed as having “criminal tendencies” of individuals from that birth country who has been viewed historically as the ‘uncivilized other’? (Anderson, Campbell & Belcourt, 2018, p. 70). The act of the government in

deporting these individuals back to their countries of origin is symbolic in and of itself. Although these individuals have no living memory of their birth country, the expulsion of them from Canada implies that they do not belong as a member of Canadian society, regardless of their length of residency, their connections and relations. The Canadian government's actions reinforce the notion that the criminality of noncitizens was developed elsewhere and is not tolerated, and in turn, the danger must be removed in the name of national security, thus echoing the colonial logics of exclusion where those who are faced with this reality are those who are of coloured skin and ultimately, the "bad" immigrant.

Methodology

When approaching this research project, conducting this study through a social justice lens was my first priority. That is, I did not want this project to present (i.e. speak on behalf) and analysis one's pain and suffering in order to illustrate how unjust the world can be at times. Instead, I wanted to understand the experiences of PRs in Canada with regard to "home" and belonging, and analyze how these understandings can be challenged and threatened by Canadian law. In Tuck & Yang's (2014) discussion on refusal within research, they highlight three axioms of social science research, with the first one being, "The subaltern can speak, but is only invited to speak her/our pain" (p. 224). Jackson and Mazzel, two scholars of qualitative research, note that researchers often prioritize amplifying voices in qualitative research because "voice is championed as "true and real," and "almost a mirror of the soul, the essence of self" (as cited in Tuck & Yang, 2014, p. 229). Tuck & Yang (2014) highlight that, more often than not, "much of the work of the academy is to reproduce stories of oppression in its own voice" and, as Bell Hooks (1990) puts it, "No need to hear your voice when I can talk about you better than you can speak about yourself" (p. 227).

When planning on how to approach a research project focusing on the Bill C-43, the first initial thought was to study those who have already been deported, like some scholars have done. This idea made sense because hearing from those who already have been impacted by Bill C-43 seemed to answer many of the questions that I was asking. I asked myself, “How would approaching my research project in this way actually speak to the social justice issue at hand?” After much thought, I decided not to approach the topic in this way because I feared that I would view myself as a “channel” to which voices can be heard (ex. Reflecting back on a “savior” position) (Vera & Gordon, as cited in Maurantonio, 2017, p. 1133). What was certain is that I did not agree with Bill C-43, and I wanted to know how this policy impacts those who call Canada “home.” From here, I decided to look at those who have not been punished by Bill C-43, and focus on their understandings of “home” and “place” with the hope to learn and gather knowledge about the concept of “home” and how PRs have or have not grown an attachment to where they currently live.

While calling upon place theory as the theoretical approach for this project, this research utilized a qualitative methodological approach. My chosen method of data gathering was in-depth interviews as they provide the researcher with rich data that allows for a deeper exploration on place focusing on the experiences of permanent residents in Canada (Rishbeth, 2014, p. 101). In the following section, the research design of this project will be discussed, as well as an explanation as to how case studies became my research strategy. My qualitative methodological approach will be highlighted through a discussion on the process of my research. This chapter will end with a section on the limitations of research for this project, while emphasising the challenges with recruitment and the inaccessible language of specific terms that

resulted in causing confusion to potential participants who were not familiar with the “legalese” term “permanent resident.”

Case Studies as the Research Design/Strategy

The use of case studies has been widespread in social science research for researchers attempting to collect contextualized and rich data. In *Case Studies: Are we rejecting rigour or rediscovering richness?* Cleborne Maddux (2000) argues that the use of case studies in research has the potential “to communicate the richness of human interactions” as well as providing an arena to which theories, such as place theory, can be applied to one’s experience (p. 15). Hartley (2004) defines case study research as “a detailed investigation” of a phenomenon that is studied within a specific context (p. 323). The aim of a case study is to “provide an analysis of the context and processes which illuminate the theoretical issues being studied” where there is no isolation or separation between the context of the data and the phenomenon as “the aim is to understand how behaviour and/or processes are influenced by, and influence context” (Hartley, 2004, p. 323). One key aspect here is context. While utilizing a case study design, the key focus of the researcher involves “understanding processes alongside their context,” which, in turn, highlights the significance of theory (Hartley, 2004, p. 324). Focusing on context within a theoretical framework allows the researcher to “make sense” of the rich data (Hartley, 2004, p. 324). In this case, place theory has been utilized to analyze the data. The case study design has often been confused with being a method, however, Hartley (2004) highlights the importance of understanding case studies as “research strategies,” rather than confusing them as a research method (p. 323). For instance, in this project, I utilized a case study research design with qualitative methods, that is, semi-structured interviews. In all, as methodologist Robert Stake

puts it, “the art of case study is the art of telling the story of what is going on” and “what is most significantly meaningful” (Mills & Durepos, 2010).

In *The Use of Qualitative Content Analysis in Case Study Research*, Kohlbacher (2006) highlights, “A case study cannot be defined through its research methods, but rather in terms of its theoretical orientation and interest in individual case” (p. 5). When conducting case studies, the emphasis is placed on “understanding processes as they occur in their context” (Hartley, 2004, p. 332). In the initial stages of planning for this project, I had hoped to conduct interviews with a sample size of approximately five participants. Due to limitations and challenges with the recruitment process, which will be discussed in detail below, I changed my research design to a case study research design. While I was disappointed in recruiting only two participants alone, I soon realized that a case study research design would be an appropriate fit for attempting to understand the meanings surrounding “home” and place for PRs who immigrated to Canada as a youth. A case study design became the ideal route for this project. Instead of conducting broader interviews with 5 participants, I was able to conduct in-depth interviews with 2 participants. This allowed for the collection of extremely rich data, allowing for a “thick description” for each case (Geertz, 1973). I also realized that the use of two case studies, as opposed to one, allowed for an analysis on the similarities and differences to take place within the context of my study. This type of analysis is most successful with the use of thick description.

The term ‘thick description’ has been used across several disciplines engaging in qualitative research to emphasize “the necessity of paying attention to significant detail” (Mills & Durepos, 2010). Methodologist, Norman Denzin, argues that thick description is important in that it allows for “thick interpretation” to occur (Mills & Durepos, 2010). Within the context of case studies, thick description goes beyond the apparent analysis and pays close attention to

“detail; context; thoughts; feelings; webs of relationships” and so forth (Mills & Durepos, 2010). For case studies specifically, the “history, context and physical setting” are the main sites to consider (Mills & Durepos, 2010). According to Mills & Durepos (2010), “Thick description is not an exact science; it is an interpretative approach to understanding the many layers of what is going on in the social world.”

Sample

This study involved interviewing two participants who fit the following criteria: One who 1) currently holds PR status in Canada; 2) currently lives in Canada; 3) immigrated to Canada at the age of 10 or younger; and 4) is currently over the age of 18. With an interest regarding the intersections of race and gender in my study, both participants were men who immigrated from Guyana. As mentioned previously in the literature review, the link between race, gender, and criminality have been the focal point of several studies in the criminology and social science field. Bill C-44, the initial bill to deport PRs based on criminality, was based on a specific case involving men originating from the Caribbean who held PR statuses. Not only does recruiting participants from Guyana allow for a focus on the experiences of immigrants of colour specifically, the experience of those who are more likely to be targeted by Bill C-43 will be evaluated, that is, the experience of immigrant men. The “likeliness” of Caribbean-born immigrants being targeted by Bill C-43 not only stems from the history of the Bill itself, but also due to the anti-Black literature and studies which show that “the conflation of being young, black, and male is routinely equated with “probable cause”” (Chan & Chunn, 2014, p. 11). Keeping within the context of Bill C-43, the perpetuation of racialized individuals in the criminal justice system as “deviant, lawless, violent, fraudulent, threatening, or dangerous” places heavier

police surveillance on this community in the “pursuit of law and order” (Chan & Chunn, 2014, p. 18-19).

When evaluating the significance of race in the Canadian criminal justice system, both racialized men and women have been proven to be placed under heavy surveillance, resulting in an overrepresentation of racialized people in prisons (Chan & Chunn, 2014, p. 28). Diving deeper into the intersections of gender, racialized men are perceived to be “trouble makers” who are “up to no good,” thus “watched” and targeted by law enforcement more intensely (Chan & Chunn, 2014, p. 35-7). While being a man of colour makes one more likely to be targeted by law enforcement in and of itself, being a noncitizen adds another layer of oppression. With both participants being racialized men who do not hold Canadian citizenship status, their experiences, while in many respects differ from one another, is unique when attempting to understand “home” and place under the lens of Bill C-43. In other words, while these individuals are not directly subjects under Bill C-43, being racialized immigrant men statistically makes the encounters with “law enforcement” more likely, thus, Bill C-43 poses a higher threat. With the narratives of race, gender, and criminality being reinforced, their experiences in Canada become a direct point of interest.

The purpose of the study was to generate preliminary knowledge regarding the experiences of permanent residents (PRs) living in Canada, who immigrated to North America from their birth country as a child. Its aim was to help inform the following question: What does Bill C-43 (The Faster Removal of Foreign Criminals Act) mean for PRs who immigrated to Canada as a child/youth? While keeping Bill C-43 as a focal point in my analysis, this research also aimed to generate knowledge regarding the definition of "home" and understanding the concept of belonging through one’s immigration experience from their birth country to Canada.

Method of Data Collection

Under REB #5713, data was collected from two research participants who immigrated to Canada as a youth (i.e. under the age of 10). A series of interviews took place which involved the completion of two separate informed consent statements. In her chapter, *Qualitative Interviewing*, Jennifer Mason (2002) notes that while interviews are one of the most common forms of qualitative research, rather than assuming that their research needs interviews for the sake of having them, one must think through why this method is appropriate for their study (p. 63). While evaluating different forms of methods, I found that qualitative, semi-structured interviews are appropriate and necessary in that they allow for one's life experience to be heard and understood. In addition, the data I collected from the interviews provided a more analytical dimension addressing the understandings around the concept of "place" and "home" that quantitative methods, alone, could not.

Participants were asked to participate in a two-step interview process. The first interview focused on the participant's personal immigration story, while exploring their understandings of identity, belonging, and the concept of "home." The purpose of the second follow-up interview was to learn and hear about the participant's opinion and understanding of Bill C-43, along with their own thoughts on the Bill's threat to them personally. The Research Ethics Board (REB) of Wilfrid Laurier University granted clearance in May of 2018 for the project. Data was collected from June of 2018 to August of 2018. All the interviews were audio-recorded and manually transcribed by the researcher. To ensure credibility, "the value and believability of the findings," dependability, "how stable the data are," and confirmability, "the neutrality and accuracy of the data," I engaged in a member-checking process (Houghton et al, 2013, p. 13). Member-checking "involves allowing participants to read the transcription of their interviews to ensure that these

have been accurately recorded and are therefore credible” (Houghton et al, 2013, p. 13). In addition to the review of the interview transcripts, participants looked over the case study write up to ensure the information presented was correct.

Limitations of Research

Due to the limited time frame of this project, the recruitment period was also limited. After receiving approval by the REB, I began to circulate emails and posters asking for those interested to contact me. The email and poster asked for individuals fitting the criteria, as mentioned above, who were interested in participating and sharing their story to contact me via email. While approximately six individuals reached out, they did not fit the criteria as a PR. Interestingly, there was confusion surrounding the legal term “permanent resident.” Four individuals interested in participating informed me that they were PRs. Upon further inquiry, it appeared that this was not the case. While the four individuals immigrated to Canada as a youth, they had obtained Canadian citizenship in their early years. Questions clarifying what I meant by “permanent resident” followed from the individuals. This informed that there is a gap regarding the legal consciousness of one’s own status in terms of terminology, which was one aspect of this study.

In mid-July, I secured participation from two individuals who fit the criteria. These participant’s stories make up the case studies in this paper. The participants in this study are friends of mine, which evoke ethical implications. Due to the relational aspect with participants, I had prior knowledge to some parts of their stories. The prior knowledge was not disclosed in this study. The data collected for this project was strictly obtained from the two interviews alone and was not based on prior knowledge.

Results

Jay's story

On February 28, 1993, Jay was born in Wakenaam, an island located in the Essequibo region in western Guyana, with his father and older sister by his mother's side (Wakenaam Island, 2013). At the time of Jay's birth, both of his mother's parents, along with three out of her four siblings, had moved out of Wakenaam island and immigrated to Toronto, Ontario in Canada. Although the majority of Jay's father's side of the family lived in Guyana, his mother wanted to migrate to Canada to not only reunite with her family, but to also provide a better a life with more opportunities for her two children.

Jay's mother started an application to immigrate to Canada through 'self-sponsorship' based on humanitarian grounds after he was born. According to an article in the Stabroek News (2008), a local newspaper in Guyana, 'self-sponsorship' is a term used only in Guyana as it does not exist in Canadian Immigration Law. In the Canadian legal context, Jay's mother applied to immigrate to Canada through a Humanitarian and Compassionate Application (H&C) highlighting two main factors: her strong family ties to her relatives living in Canada, and that moving to Canada would be in the best interests of her children. According to the Immigration and Citizenship Glossary provided by the Government of Canada, people like Jay's mother can apply to immigrate to Canada on H&C grounds even if they do not fit in the other categories and/or criteria to become permanent residents in Canada (i.e. immigration as a skilled worker, self-employed, a caregiver, etc.) (Government of Canada, 2018). Through the Visa Office in Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, who is responsible for Permanent Resident Applications from Guyana, Jay's mother was able to do a 'self-sponsorship' with humanitarian grounds for herself

and her children. With Jay's grandparents and uncles residing permanently in Canada, her mother had a strong case. To strengthen her case further, her eldest brother pledged for them. During the time when Jay's mother was preparing her application, his father provided support for his own mother and siblings, therefore, he made the sacrifice and did not go through the immigration process with his wife. He decided to stay back in Guyana and help keep his family members afloat.

Jay lived in Guyana until the age of three. In 1996, after their application was processed, he immigrated to Canada with his mother and sister, who was thirteen at the time. Upon arrival, all three of them obtained permanent resident status. One year after immigrating to Canada, Jay began kindergarten along with the rest of the children his age living in Canada.

Settling in Canada was not an easy transition for Jay's mother. Although she had support from her relatives, without her husband immigrating to Canada with the family, she was required to work two jobs to ensure that she could provide for her children. Due to a lack of information and her focus on survival, she did not apply for citizenship for herself or her children. At the time, providing a roof over her children's head and food for them to eat was her main priority. She was successful in bringing her children to a place where they could have a better life than she had, and with their permanent resident statuses secured, citizenship did not to be necessary at the time. Applying for citizenship was something she wanted to do eventually, but she never got around to.

In 2001, Jay's dad was sponsored to immigrate to Canada and reunite with his wife and children. The brother of Jay's father moved back with their mother, which allowed for Jay dad to migrate to Canada. At the age of eight, Jay's family was together again, and their journey in Canada was just beginning. With the arrival of Jay's father, there was additional financial

support which meant that his mother was no longer required to work two jobs. When she worked two jobs, she relied on Jay's elder sister to help take care of him. Now, working one full-time job, she was able to spend time with her children. With both Jay's parents working full time, they were able to purchase a family home in Scarborough, Ontario.

Now 25 years old, Jay describes Toronto, Canada as "home." His birth country is a place he considers to be foreign. He has no living memory of Guyana, and besides being offered family trips to go back, he had no intention of returning. To him, Guyana is just where he was born. Canada is the place where he truly feels secure. He has no personal ties to people in Guyana, and relies on his parents for information about his family over there. He has never personally spoken or built relationships with anyone currently residing in Guyana. All his friends are based in Canada. He finished school, began his career, and has no intention of moving to another country.

Trevor's story

Trevor was born on November 17th, 1995 in Guyana. Like Trevor, his family also originated from Wakenaam Island. Born in Wakenaam, he was his parent's first child. Before he was conceived, Trevor's father began an application to immigrate to Canada as a skilled worker. The original plan was for Trevor's father to immigrate to Canada first, then sponsor his wife once he settled in. Around the same time Trevor's mother found out she was pregnant, his father's application to immigrate to Canada was approved and processed. Closer to the end of his mother's pregnancy, his father left Guyana and moved to Canada by himself.

Upon arrival to Canada, Trevor's father worked hard to establish himself in this new country. He began saving up financially so that he could soon sponsor his wife and new born

baby. While Trevor's dad began preparing for the sponsorship of his family, Trevor's mother had the support of her two brothers in Guyana. Throughout her pregnancy and right after Trevor was born, she had her two brothers by her side assisting her.

From when he was born in 1995 until the age of one, Trevor was raised by his mother in Wakenaam. In 1996, Trevor's father was able to sponsor his wife and child to come live with him in Canada. He was able to prove that he had sufficient fund to take of them financially. Trevor and his mother reunited with his father in Ontario, Canada. When recalling back to moving to Canada, Trevor does not remember anything about Guyana since he immigrated at such a young age. Out of the 22 years he has been living, 21 years has been spent in Canada.

Two years after moving to Canada, in 1998, Trevor's mother gave birth to a baby boy. Due to being born in Canada, Trevor's little brother was automatically granted Canadian citizenship based on his birth country. Out of the whole family, only Trevor's baby brother held citizenship. Trevor's mother was aware of this, and she wanted both children to hold the same immigration status. For the next few years after the birth of her youngest son, Trevor's mom began looking into the process of obtaining Canadian citizenship for herself and her son. She began studying and saving up money for the citizenship test.

When she had the means to take the test, Trevor's mom arranged to write it immediately. When the results were given back, she found out that she had failed the test. The preparation and process in gaining citizenship status was financially and mentally draining, and with the added embarrassment of failing, Trevor's mom stepped away from the process and never attempted it again. Reflecting back on it now, Trevor thought that his mother would eventually go back and try again, but this was not the case. Now, at the age of 22, he, himself, has never thought to go through the citizenship process yet.

Thinking about his brother's citizenship status now compared to his, Trevor felt like certain arrangements were unfair growing up. For instance, his brother would be able to travel over border to the states for day trips with other family members, while Trevor stayed home because going to the U.S. required a visa for him. For a quick day trip, that lasted no longer than 12 hours, his parents felt that it was easier for him to stay with them at home rather than going with his younger brother and extended family members. Recalling back to how he felt at that age, Trevor did not care that much because he was so young, and he had other cousins who were PRs that stayed back for those trips as well. In those moments, he would play with his cousins while his brother went to the U.S. When his brother was able to do certain activities, such as going over border for trips, Trevor was not sure why he was not given the same privileges. Growing up, he always thought that his brother was the 'favourite,' which is why he was allowed to certain things.

It was not until 2014, when he applied for a passport so that he could go on a family vacation, that he realized he had a different status than his brother. His brother's process in obtaining a passport was quick and easy. He wondered why his brother had to apply in a different office than him and his parents. He wondered why he had so much documentation to submit. His brother received his passport within a few weeks, while the rest of his family received them months after. He also questioned why his brother's passport looked different than his. When they went on their family trip, he felt it was inconvenient that he had to carry and show extra documentation (i.e. the PR card) when passing through different immigration officials. In his eyes, the whole thing was unfair.

Despite his legal immigration status, when people ask Trevor where he is from, he says he is from Toronto. When asked what does "home" look like or mean to him, he stated, "We the

North,” a known slogan used by NBA’s Toronto Raptors. All Trevor’s friends live in Ontario, Canada. While he did visit Guyana three times with his family, he described these visits as “vacations to visit family.” When thinking about his future, he says that his life is already set in Canada.

Analysis and discussion

In *Wherever I Find Myself: Stories by Canadian Immigrant Women*, Matejova (2017) explains the broader experience of immigrants as the following, “Immigrants are permanent outsiders. Their old homes, no longer “theirs,” become not much more than a fading memory. Their new homes, not yet “theirs,” are grounds of an everyday struggle for acceptance” (p. 26). In her piece, *Canada is My Land*, Sadiq (2017) explains that, despite living in Canada for 22 years out of her 36 years of living, she is as much as a minority in her birth country as she is in Canada (p. 111). The purpose of noting these perspectives is to illustrate the complexity of being an immigrant, in and of itself. Feeling as the “other,” the ones that can never *truly* belong and be called “Canadian” and who always feel like a minority despite living in Canada for the majority of their lives are common experiences of immigrants in the broader sense. However, while Jay and Trevor may have similar experiences, they also have unique stories in that they immigrated to Canada at the age of one and three, meaning that their entire lives were built here. Who they have become and the relationships that they have created were built here. Their ties to their home countries are faint, if they exist at all. To even think of being deported to their birth countries evokes feelings of disbelief, anger, and arguments of unfairness.

With Bill C-43 utilized as a backdrop for the following analysis, some of the questions that will be explored includes: What does Bill C-43 mean for those who have immigrated to Canada at a young age (i.e. under the age of 10) and have come to regard Canada as their

“home” despite their precarious migration status? Can Bill C-43 be viewed as a law that operates as a tool of oppression that echoes the colonial logics of exclusion? How do PRs who immigrated to Canada as a youth view their status? What does belonging mean to them? How does this Bill impact their experiences or challenge their understandings?

PR status as a marker of difference: Exploring the legal consciousness of Jay and Trevor

Before attempting to understand what “home” and place mean for Jay and Trevor, it was a priority to evaluate their legal consciousness of their statuses. When asked what their current immigration status was, both Jay and Trevor stated that they were aware that they were PRs. To get a better grasp of their legal consciousness, that is, to explore their understandings of the term and status of “permanent resident” I asked what having a PR status meant to them.

PI: What is your immigration status right now? Where do you hold citizenship with?

Trevor: I'm a permanent resident.

PI: What does that mean to you ... what does “permanent resident” mean?

Trevor: I feel like honestly like... I don't have the privilege of doing certain things that other Canadian residents do.

PI: What do you mean by that? What things can't you do that other Canadian residents can?

Trevor: I feel like... I can't go to certain countries, you know, like I need a visa to go some places.

For Trevor, the process of traveling was a main marker of difference between being a PR and being a Canadian citizen. This can be explained by his experience with his little brother

having Canadian citizenship bestowed upon him by birth. While his brother enjoyed the privileges of crossing the Canada-U.S. border without having to apply for a visa, Trevor did not enjoy this. Growing up, he always felt like he was different and less privileged than his younger brother. In attempt to understand Trevor's experience navigating throughout his life with a PR status, I asked for additional examples to illustrate where he felt like he was treated differently than his brother and friends who did have Canadian citizenship.

Trevor: I feel like they have an easier way in life. To be honest, they have certain privileges. Like, for applying to school, I had to go through so much ... my friends with citizenship status just needed to sign one, two papers and bam, they were in class.

PI: Wow. I didn't know that.

Trevor: Yeah, I had to wait! I had more paperwork ... I had to start class late because of my paperwork... it didn't go through yet.

Another marker of difference for Trevor was the experience with beginning college and going through a different, more tedious process than his peers. For him, going through different processes through traveling and through schooling brought awareness to his status as a PR. In these moments, feelings of difference became apparent and the legal consciousness of his status grew.

While Trevor described his PR status as a marker of difference, when asked to describe what being a PR meant to him, Jay associated his status with sameness, stating, "It means, like, I... I can live in Canada without ... worrying... like, not worrying about ... I can work, I can get a job or...[pause] I don't have to worry about ... you know... I don't have to worry about getting caught at work, like, illegally basically. To me, if I feel like just like everyone else, like, as

in...in the sense of, like, I have rights just like everyone else.” For Jay, being a PR meant belonging in Canada and feeling like “everyone else” which closely relates to Abdoul’s experiences. When asked to provide an example of what he cannot do as a PR, Jay spoke about voting and travelling, stating:

Jay: I can’t vote. When I want to vote, but I can’t vote.

PI: When the campaigns are going on, what do you think?

Jay: I just see the signs. I don't pay attention because I know, it's like a restriction, you know you can't go there... so I'm like, okay never mind. Or when I go travelling. Yeah, traveling takes extra time because I have to pull out, like, 30 documents. It's like I'm getting cleared to go to space or something.

Guyanese as a “background”: Feeling “Canadian” like “everyone else”

In each interview, I asked both participants what they say when people ask them where they are from. Jay stated, “When people ask me where I'm from ... I tell them that my parents are from Guyana because I don't... me personally, I don't see myself like them, like I don't know nothing about my birth country. People ask me what part of Guyana I am from and I tell them the part that my parents are from.” When further describing his parents compared to himself, Jay stated that his parents were “*Guyanese-Guyanese*,” a unique identity that he did not experience. He described being ‘*Guyanese-Guyanese*’ as being the “whole package” of being Guyanese, that is, “being West Indian to the bone.” In addition, he continued to reiterate that this was an experience unique to his parents, one that he never encountered. Despite his PR status, Jay felt “Canadian” despite his PR status.

When asked if why he did not experience this, Jay stated that for him, Guyana is “just a background” and that everything he learned, and everything he knows is based on being in Canada, unlike his parents who learned everything they know from Guyana. He describes his experience living in Guyana versus his parents as the following:

Jay: ... they grew up there. They *actually* lived there. But for me, personally, ...it’s just a story ... a tale. Basically, to me, and it is sad to say [laughs] well, like a tale to me... I don't think or have stories about Guyana from myself. It just stays as whatever they [his parents] say. I know about Guyana from what they tell me. I don't take it anywhere farther than that because there's nothing there for me to reminisce about. They're like, “Oh... you know this and that” and I don't know about it. I never experienced it.

PI: What do you mean when you say they *actually* lived there?

Jay: They went to school there. They spent good time there ... they know places. They tell me stories like, "In Guyana this will be like this" because ... they always ask me if I remember this or if I remember that. I'm always like, "No...".

PI: How would you describe your parent’s relationship to Guyana versus yours?

Jay: They're attached to their country, like sentimentally because they have a house there, they have friends, they have ... where their brothers and sisters... they grew up there, they have memories that ...you know they can talk about. Me personally... there's nothing for me to talk about. So, I would say I have no attachment ... but I have... I can speak of stuff... memories I have in Canada, but when you... when we speak about my birth country, there's no memories for me to tell you. Like, I've even been offered free trips to go visit a family members... but I didn't say yes because what am I going to do there? You know... I ...there's nothing there for me personally to go do or no one there

that I know. I would just be following my parents around. And from what I expect... from what I hear, it's not a comfortable environment, like, what I'm used to. Where I live, like, where I live right now there's this standard of living. It's what I am used to. I'll be, personally... I'll be out of my comfort zone. [laughs]

Trevor had an almost identical response as Jay. Regarding being asked where he's from, he explained, "If they ask where I'm from, I say Toronto. If they ask what my background is, I say Guyanese." I followed by asking Trevor if he views himself as an immigrant in his daily life, and if he is always consciously aware that he is an immigrant and not Canadian. He stated:

Trevor: I forget it. To be honest, yes, I forget that I have a different status than my friends or some family members. It's only when I go on vacation, or something regarding my permanent resident status, that I go back and think, and I'm like, Oh yeah, I'm a Guyanese citizen, not Canadian.

Both Trevor and Jay experience feelings of being "Canadian" despite being PRs. They refer to their backgrounds being Guyanese, but describe themselves being from Canada. This is interesting when attempting to understand how they describe the concept of "home." Both of their responses illustrate a sense of belonging in Canada—a place they feel rooted and secure. However, the reality is, to be a PR in Canada means, according to the Canadian government, that one does not fully belong and is not entitled to the same treatment and privileges as Canadian citizens. As much as one might feel like they *do* belong, in terms of place making, identity building, and meaning making, their legal immigration status as a PR is a reminder that the Canadian state characterizes them as "outsiders" who do not truly belong in Canada.

Feeling Canadian and not feeling completely Guyanese despite their PR status is extremely interesting. To build on this, I asked Trevor if he thinks about his birth country. He responded, "Honestly, I don't really think about that... like Guyana where I was born. I focus on Canada, like Toronto, because that is where I've been living, that's where I grew up." During the interview process, both participants, despite their immigration status, call Canada their "home," while Guyana is referred to as a foreign place that they were born, but have no connection or attachment to. Similar to the case of Abdoul Abdi, both participants called Canada their "home" and the only place they have ever known, while viewing their birth country as unfamiliar territory. There were several instances throughout the interview process where the responses indicated that they "felt Canadian" despite their immigration status. During the interviews, both participants expressed feelings of belonging to Canada.

In terms of belonging, Jay described his experience in Canada as feeling like "everyone else." When asked to explain what he meant by this, he stated that, although he was a PR, he had rights "just like everyone else."

Jay: Well... basically I mean ... I can do what they do. Anything that they can do, I can do. Driving, doing anything that they do every day... like anything that they are capable of doing, I can do.

PI: When you say "everyone else," do you mean everyone else living in Canada?

Jay: Yes, anyone else living in Canada, born here, everyone I went to school with, my friends, just everyone.

In terms of making friends and feeling the same as citizens, both participants stated that the age when they immigrated to Canada was an important factor. For instance, Trevor stated

that immigrating to Canada at the age of one allowed him to grow up in Toronto with the other children his age, therefore, he felt just like the other youth. Similarly, Jay stated,

Jay: When I came, yeah, I was... I was young. But I remember, at that time too, it is easy to build a relationship at that time with kids, right, when you're at such a young age. I started school with all the kids at the same time, so we were *all* new to school.

Jay and Trevor were too young to go to school in their birth country, thus specifically growing up and attending school in Canada exclusively evoked feelings of “sameness” to the other children. Going through the same processes as Canadian born children made them feel like they were no different than their Canadian-born peers, and that they belonged in Canadian society just like the other children. There was no special school for PRs. They were taught the same things as Canadian citizen children and went through the same levels of schooling, therefore, through these processes, growing up with “everyone else” allowed for them to feel like they truly belong, which ultimately led to Canada being a place they came to regard as “home.”

Feelings of belonging in a diverse city: “I am who I am based on where I have been”

When asked about identity, Jay stated that the person he has become is based on living and being taught the “Canadian way.” While navigating through daily tasks, he does not think of his status, because he feels like Canada is a place where he belongs.

PI: Do you see yourself as Canadian? Like day to day...living in Toronto, do you feel like you are a Canadian?

Jay: In my eyes, yes.

He continued to explain his feelings of belonging: “I think where I am from is where I live because I don’t think about the country since I feel like I am from Canada... since I lived almost

my entire life here, basically. I feel that's where I'm from.” He explained that these feelings of belonging intensify because he is expected to look after certain responsibilities, such as bills, just like Canadian citizens.

PI: Do you just so you see yourself as belonging to your community and just like your friends who are Canadian citizens?

Jay: Yes. Yeah ‘cause I do everything like everyone else... I work every day, I went to school and graduated like everyone else, I pay my bills like everyone. So that doesn't make me... that doesn't make them any less than me or make me any less than them.

The feelings of belonging as described by these participants are unique to living in a diverse city like Toronto. Jay initially highlights this, stating that the phenomenon of belonging that he has experienced would not occur if he immigrated to a “white-dominated town” where racism was less subtle.

PI: OK. It's interesting because if you were say... if you were to immigrate from Guyana and you actually moved to one of those small towns, like, a white-dominated...

Jay: yeah

PI: ...community

Jay: I wouldn't... I would not want to be here, honestly. Moving from Guyana to a small town, I would feel like I don't belong.

PI: It sounds like contrast compared to how you feel... how you felt when you grew up in Toronto.

Jay: Yes.

PI: You felt you did belong...

Jay: Yes.

PI: And you say you don't feel like you belong in Guyana.

Jay: That's true.

Here, Jay states that if he settled in a less diverse town or city, he would feel like he did not truly belong anywhere. Due to leaving at the age of three, he would not be 'Guyanese enough' to feel like he belonged to that country, yet settling in a town that is unaccepting of people of color, he would feel like that is not a place he is welcomed or a place where he belongs.

PI: Can you imagine living in a small white community and not feel like you belong and then thinking about where you came from and also feeling like you don't belong?

Jay: It would be like a nightmare.

PI: What if someone had a similar story to you, where they came to Canada at a very young age but they moved to a town with mostly white people. In a place where racism is likely, what would home then look like for them? Like, if home is not completely Guyana, because they never really lived there, and home is not that town because of racism and the people did not accept them...

Jay: Mhm...

PI: ...what would home be, or what do you think their experience would look like if this was the case?

Jay: I think that they will feel like they don't have a place. They won't have a place to fit in. I think they would be stressed out because there will be a lot of pressure on them.

They will try to make friends, be nice but the other people might still upset them. I think it would be really hard on the person. They will feel like they don't fit in anywhere. They will feel lost.

Similarly, Trevor added insights to the uniqueness of growing up in a diverse city. He stated, "... growing up in, like, an urban city like Toronto ... where there's, like, Asian people, black people –everything all mixed up. Sometimes I feel like, because the culture is so big, we all just tend to be one." I continued to ask Trevor about how these feelings would change if he settled in a less diverse place.

PI: How would you feel if, instead of moving to Toronto where it is so diverse, you moved to 'white-dominated' town?

Trevor: Like Aurora or Orangeville... Oh my god. I would feel out of place.

PI: What would happen?

Trevor: Honestly, I would be lost. I wouldn't belong anywhere.

It was clear that both participants, despite having a PR status, felt as though they were "Canadian" through their experiences in Canada. They both experienced feelings of belonging in Canada, and not to their birth country. Here, racial diversity evoked enhanced feelings of belonging. As famously stated by Maya Angelou, "...in diversity there is beauty and there is strength" (Goodreads, 2018). While this quote positively responds to the harsh realities of racism that people of colour face, Canada has adopted the principle of diversity as strength in attempt to construct its makeup as "multicultural." In 1971, Prime Minister Trudeau first introduced multiculturalism as a public policy that would change the discourse of White Canada to Canada as a nation with open arms to diverse populations (Henry et al, 1998, p. 47). While the topic of multiculturalism has been highly debated, Henry et al (1998) highlight the race-based analysis of multiculturalism arguing that "the policy and practice of multiculturalism continues to position certain ethno-racial groups at the margins, rather than the mainstream of public culture and

national identity. While “tolerating,” “accommodating,” “appreciating,” and “celebrating” differences, it allows for the preservation of the cultural hegemony of the dominant cultural group” (p. 48). While multiculturalism looks like a practice of inclusion, “segregation of communities” is the realistic result (Johnson, 2006, p. 92). Writer Neil Bissoondath argues that multiculturalism not only highlights ethnic differences, but defines people of colour by those differences, resulting in the perpetuation of stereotypes (as cited in Johnson, 2006, p. 92). It is not surprising that Jay and Trevor experienced feelings of being Canadian as they both grew up in Toronto, a city that prides itself on multiculturalism and diversity as strength. Being a part of racially diverse city, exploring how Jay and Trevor understood the concept of “home” despite their legal immigration status was another point of interest. In a “multicultural” location where diversity is emphasized, what did “home” mean and look like?

To learn how each participant understood the concept of “home” I asked what each participant associated with the word itself. Here is how Trevor described the concept of “home”:

PI: When you hear the word “home” what do you think of? Like, what does home mean to you? Where is home?

Trevor: It is here. Yes, it’s Toronto for sure.

PI: Do you think of Guyana as your home?

Trevor: No... it's just basically like a name.

PI: Do you think your status relates to your understanding of “home”?

Trevor: No, because home is Toronto, but I am a permanent resident.

Here, Trevor clearly associates “home” with Toronto, the city in which he currently lives. He notes that his status does not determine how he has come to understand what “home” means, but, at the same time he highlights that he is a PR, acknowledging that his status has alternative

meanings. Nonetheless, he states that home is somewhere unrelated to where his legal immigration status defines it as, and that home is Toronto.

Through a discussion on his parents visiting Guyana, Jay described how he views Canada, specifically Ontario, as his “home.”

PI: Do you hear your parents maybe going there and then... do you ever wonder, like, about that?

Jay: Well, my parents *do* go back to visit. They have friends and some family there. They asked me if I want to go, but I always say no because there's nothing there for me. I don't know anyone there. I don't know the lifestyle there. I'd rather stay where I'm comfortable... which is here, in Canada. I know... I know Canada as in... you can put me anywhere in Canada, or basically Ontario and that's where I feel like that's *my* home. I'm comfortable here. But if you take me to my birthplace... well, I'm out of my comfort zone because I don't know there.

PI: Can you tell me a little bit about what you mean when you talk about your comfort zone?

Jay: Like, if you take me out my area, like I go work Brampton, I work all over. All over, I work, you name it. Right?

PI: Yes.

Jay: But there's nothing, there's nothing... as soon as I get on the 401 and I pass Victoria Park. I just pass right over Victoria Park. I feel, I honestly feel, like, yeah, I'm home. Like, this is me right here. I feel safe. This is me, nothing is going to or can happen here. This is my place. Another reason, too, is when I get back into the Toronto/Scarborough area, I know so many people here. Right. It's people I went to school with, people I've

seen at barber shops, people... people I come across... We make friends. Some people I know from when I was in high school or when I used to go to the basketball court. Older people, younger people, you know, guys my age... It's like when I'm in Scarborough, I'm home, like, I'm comfortable.

PI: What are some reasons that it is comfortable for you?

Jay: It's comfortable because, one thing, I know people, I know my area, I know where I'm at all times. I know my surroundings at all times. I can be myself, like as in, I don't have to act a certain way to fit in.

Jay describes “home” as a meaningful place. He includes his relationships to the people in the location, and feelings of “comfort.” For him, “home” is Ontario, a place he feels secure, accepted, and familiar with.

The experiences of Jay and Trevor are unique, where the meanings of “home” are complex. For them, “home” is the place that has been made meaningful to them. “Home” is not defined by their immigration statuses, but rather home is defined by their connections, relations, experiences and emotions within and to Canada. Their responses illustrate the emotional bonds they experience with the place they have lived in the majority of their lives, while simultaneously defining Guyana as nothing more than their birth country. While Guyana means more to their parents or relatives who have lived there, for Trevor and Jay, Guyana is an unfamiliar place.

Exploring Bill C-43: The construction of the “foreign criminal”

With a better understanding of each participants experience and understandings of “home,” bringing Bill C-43 to their attention allowed for a discussion on the injustice surrounding this policy and how it would be life-altering to them. As mentioned in the literature

review, deportation has a far heavier impact on non-citizens than the imposition of a criminal sentence. Under Bill C-43, not only is a deportation order possible after obtaining a criminal sentence of at least six months, PRs will find out about this order after they served their time in jail. It is important to revisit regarding the “good” (i.e. the white conforming person whose ideologies align with the West) versus “bad” immigrant (the racialized, ‘deviant’ other who is more likely to reoffend). The title of Bill C-43 itself reinforces ideas surrounding “us” and “them,” while targeting PRs as non-Canadian others who are a danger to Western society, thus echoing the colonial logics of exclusion.

Prior to asking the participants about Bill C-43 in depth, I decided to ask them about their initial thoughts on the term “foreign criminal” and who it could be referring to. Here is how Jay defined the term “foreign criminal”:

Jay: Foreign Criminals... I think it is someone who committed a crime somewhere else.

PI: Can you give me an example?

Jay: Okay, like someone who committed a crime in another country then came back to Canada. Foreign Criminal.

PI: Okay, so example... someone committed a crime in the U.S. and came to Canada... Foreign Criminal.

Jay: Yes, foreign criminal. The act was not committed here, it was committed somewhere else.

Trevor responded in a similar way.

PI: When you hear the words “foreign criminal” what do you think that means?

Trevor: Straight from their country ...

PI: Yes

Trevor: ...and they did a crime back home.

In both instances, the “foreign” criminal was defined as the “other” who committed a crime outside of Canada. The foreign criminal was, in no way, related to PRs, according to Jay and Trevor’s initial thoughts. I proceeded to ask questions regarding Bill C-43 directly. I started with asking if the participants heard of this Bill. Jay was not familiar with the Bill at all, and heard of it for the first time during our interview. After discussing the Bill in further detail, Jay’s comments were filled with shock, confusion, and frustration.

Jay: Honestly, I think it doesn't make sense to me. Reason being... I was taught everything I know here in Canada. How can I be a foreign criminal if all I know is this? All I know is Canada. Like yeah, if I do something then I can be a criminal, but not a ‘foreign criminal.’ I don't understand. I didn't come to Canada after committing a crime. So... I don't know. I feel the word they use is a very strong word and they try to make us feel less than. They make you feel different from everyone else, but if you want me to feel different than everyone else, let me pay different taxes. [pause] Fine, label me something else, but they can't expect us to contribute like citizens while treating us different. It's not fair.

The awareness of constructing PRs as the “deviant other” is apparent in Jay’s statement. He argues that while engaging in criminal activity *can* make him a criminal, it cannot make him a “foreign criminal” because who he is and what he has learned derived from living in Canada. For Jay, labeling him as a foreigner is inaccurate and is used specifically to make PRs feel like “less than” citizens even though they contribute to society in almost identical ways. Stating that PRs

are treated as “less than” illustrates the colonial logics of exclusion where PRs are “others” who are “unworthy” of being held to the same standard (i.e. criminal rather than foreign criminal) as citizens.

Building on this, I turned the focus back onto the title of the Bill and asked for his opinion on it after learning more about what Bill C-43 meant for PRs in Canada.

Jay: They are trying to make themselves like they are better and they are putting everyone down. They make Guyana look bad, you know, if they want to deport someone back there because they are a criminal. It’s like they think only criminals come from there, or this goes on there. But then again... so what happens to people? Like me, as a PR, I commit a crime and a citizen commits a crime, right? I get deported, what about the other person? He should be doing life too, right?

PI: Well, that’s another interesting thing. It is almost like a PR gets a double sentence because they serve the original sentence, but then they may also face a deportation order as a second, or double consequence. Whereas the citizen just serves the sentence and does not face the risk of deportation.

Jay: Oh...

PI: You mentioned that everything you are, or who you have become is because of your development of yourself in Canada, right?

Jay: Yes

PI: So, if you were told that you were going to be deported to Guyana because you’re too dangerous to be in Canada. What would your reaction be to that?

Jay: Okay so, if now I committed something and I am ‘too dangerous’ to be here, what about the people who commit the same thing and go back on the street... aren’t they too

dangerous to be in society? If you are going to target someone about their status, just say straight up it is about their status.

After informing Jay that there was no appeal process under Bill C-43, he responded:

Jay: It's like, you don't have the opportunity to explain yourself. It's unfair. It is really unfair. It is like getting a speeding ticket and not being able to go in front of a judge and explain what happened. It is not fair at all.

PI: Do you think it is important for them to know your story and when you came?

Jay: Yes. It makes a huge difference.

Unlike Jay, Trevor heard of Bill C-43 when he was in high school but was not aware that it involved PRs. While discussing certain laws that have a minimum sentence of six months, Trevor demonstrated an advanced knowledge regarding criminal law in Canada. He explained that his knowledge stemmed from a course called 'Criminal Code' that he took in college. He was enrolled in the Border Security/Immigration Officer Program, which is extremely interesting when considering his understanding of belonging and national identity. For instance, while being a PR, the Canadian government defines one's status as not fully belonging to Canadian society. Trevor choosing his career path as a CBSA officer is interesting and speaks to the concept of belonging. Trevor feels "Canadian" enough to pursue a career that protects Canada as a nation. This also influenced his perspective on Bill C-43 in the early stages of the interview. When asked about his initial thoughts on Bill C-43, Trevor stated,

Trevor: You know what, I do think it is fair. You know why? No one should be committing a crime in the first place.

PI: Mhm

Trevor: Right? No one should be committing a crime in the first place. So, if you commit a crime, deal with the penalty.

PI: A PR will deal with the penalty and serve the time just like Canadian citizens...but they might have a second penalty because of their status... which is deportation.

Trevor: but... how big is the crime? It can't be something stupid like stealing a chocolate bar from the store.

Here, the denial of being deported for a petty crime became clear from Trevor's responses. I proceed to explain the details of Bill C-43.

PI: Anything that receives a minimum sentence of 6 months in jail. So... actually yes, it is possible to go to jail for at least 6 months for stealing a chocolate bar. It is theft under \$5000 and a court will decide the penalty... but it is possible.

Trevor: ...WHAT?

PI: It is possible.

Trevor: Okay, but let's be realistic... that is never going to happen.

Again, the denial of the realities of Bill C-43 is clear for Trevor. I continued to ask what him would do if he found himself subject to this immigration policy.

PI: If Canada tries to tell you, because you are a PR and you committed a crime, you are a foreign criminal...

Trevor: I don't know. I think it is about how everyone stands up for themselves. If you don't know how to talk to a judge, then obviously you will be screwed.

PI: Under Bill c-43 there is no judge.

Trevor: What do you mean?

PI: There is no appeal process. A PR in this situation won't be able to stand up for themselves or tell their story because there is no opportunity for that. There's no appeals. There is no judge to stand in front of.

Trevor: [pause]

PI: What do you think about that? Think about it as if it happened to you... someone who came to Canada at the age of 1. What do you think? What if they tell you to go back to Guyana.

Trevor: Nah, that is bullshit because I was raised here my whole life. Like everything I know... Canada taught me it.

PI: Under this law, you won't be able to talk and explain how you want to.

Trevor: That is fucked up. What can you do... like, you have no say.

Trevor's opinion of Bill C-43 quickly changed after finding out more details about the policy. Initially, he was confident that he could defend himself due to his knowledge that he obtained in Canada, and that he is aware of the "appropriate" ways to approach and talk to a judge. In this example, Trevor, before knowing that there is no appeal process under Bill C-43, argues that due to his Canadian-like identity, that is, growing up and being educated the "Canadian way," he can navigate through certain systems confidently because of his knowledge and story of being 'more Canadian' than Guyanese. Here, the ways in which Trevor felt Canadian, like he truly belonged in Canada, were revealed, thus when learning about the realities of Bill C-43, his ideas surrounding who he is labeled as and the ways in which the state utilizes practices of exclusion on PRs put the reality of his precarious migration status into perspective.

Conclusion

Summary of findings, analysis & discussion

Abdoul's story provides a real-life example of how one's place they came to regard as "home," a place made meaningful through relationships and the building of one's self identity, can be stripped away in an instant. The realities of what being a PR in Canada involves, the rights one has and the rights one does not have, show how the Canadian state reconstructs "us" and "them." For Abdoul who immigrated to Canada at such a young age, after coming into contact with the criminal justice system, he realized that his understanding of "home" did not mean much to the state, but rather, the state's labeling and construction of what home *should* be for him was legitimized. While his deportation order was never processed, his story reveals how the state constructs one as "not Canadian enough," and what the implications of being an "outsider" can look like, especially through processes that are inherently racist.

Canadian law was founded and built on the continued denial of Indigenous lives. The law was initially created to create and maintain a White settler nation. Bill C-43 is a current law that works as a tool of oppression for PRs in Canada, while disguised as a shield of protection for Canadian citizens. To fully view Bill C-43 through a social justice lens, it must be placed within the context of colonialism and viewed as a mechanism that sustains and legitimizes the colonial state. While the violence against Indigenous peoples and the continued denial of their existence cannot be conflated with the oppression towards migrants, migrants face similar logics of exclusion that can be traced from colonial periods. The colonial logics of exclusion are clearly implemented into immigration law, in that keeping migrants as "outsiders" in need of heightened surveillance, control, and consequences allows for the maintenance of the Canadian state.

Applying Bill C-43 to the experiences of Jay and Trevor illustrate the harm that would be inflicted onto a PR who immigrated to Canada as a youth and came into contact with the criminal justice system. More specifically, Jay and Trevor's understanding of "home" and

feelings of belonging were associated with their lives in Canada, and not their birth countries. Both participants describe Canada as being “home” to them, a place they truly feel like they belong and can be themselves. As mentioned previously, “home” can be viewed as one’s “safe haven,” and as illustrated by the responses in the interviews, Bill C-43 poses a severe threat to Jay and Trevor’s “safe havens.” Taking this into account, being forcibly removed from the place they have come to regard as “home” is unjust, and when taking into account that these individuals have no personal relations or connections to their birth country, the very thought of being deported to a foreign place illustrates the lack of care and recognition for their lives.

During the study, Jay and Trevor’s responses demonstrated their awareness of having PR statuses, however, their ideas of what this meant differed. For Trevor, having a PR status evoked feelings of difference where he explained he enjoyed less privileges and had to go through different processes than Canadian citizens. For Jay, having a PR status meant he enjoyed some of the same rights as Canadian citizens and felt like “everyone else.” For both participants, navigating through their daily lives and forgetting that their status was different than the people they interacted with was a common phenomenon, however, they both experienced a heightened legal consciousness of their immigration statuses during traveling processes.

Jay and Trevor’s stories illustrate that they are both complex young people with multiple identities. Unlike their parents, they are not *Guyanese*-Guyanese, but due to their immigration statuses, they are not officially or completely Canadian despite the feelings of belonging they encounter. For them, Canada is “home” and Guyana is their birth country, a place meaningful for their parents, but not themselves personally. Canada, and specifically Toronto, is defined as “home” and allows for them to truly feel like they belong, with diversity being a main factor. In all, their understandings of “home” is ultimately unrelated to their immigration status, but

determined by feelings of belonging and constructions of their identities. For Jay and Trevor, Canada is a place full of meaning –a place that strongly impacted who they have become. However, as much as one might feel like they belong in Canada, their legal immigration status as a PR is a reminder that the Canadian state does not view them as individuals who *truly* belong, and that, despite how rooted they feel, their lives can be stripped from them if they face consequences under Bill C-43.

Implications for practice, policy & research

Throughout the research process (i.e. recruitment), it came to my attention that many newcomers and immigrants are unaware of their statuses or what their statuses mean. For instance, as mentioned previously, potential participants approached me thinking that they were considered to be PRs, when they were actually Canadian citizens. For practitioners in the field working with communities that have various immigration statuses, ensuring that people know which immigration status they have is a priority. In addition, it is crucial for people to be aware of how they came to Canada. For instance, in Abdoul's story, he states that initially, he was not aware that he was a refugee. All he knew is that he came to Canada at a very young age with his family members. He felt like he was like "everyone else," and while in the custody of the state, the social workers interacting in charge of guiding him did not help develop his legal consciousness regarding his immigration status. The journey he went through regarding his immigration status in Canada occurred when he was a child and was never talked about with him personally by the social workers while he was growing up. In this case, practitioners have a role in supporting and providing resources to a person so that they become aware of their immigration status. For people like Abdoul, who immigrated to Canada at a very young age, simply knowing

what status they have and the details of their immigration story pertaining to status can help them to understand more about how they are viewed in the eyes of the state, and what rights they do and do not have while residing in Canada under their current status.

It is not enough for people to just know what immigration status they have. They must also be aware of what their status ultimately means for them in terms of understanding the place they live and the rights they may or may not have. As evident by the responses given by Jay and Trevor, while one may know that they have a PR status, understanding what that particular status means and what it does not mean varied. While Trevor viewed the meaning of having a PR status as being someone who does not enjoy the same rights as Canadian citizens, Jay viewed having a PR status as relating to sameness, in that he could work, have rights, and navigate through life very similar to Canadian citizens. Jay and Trevor have unique experiences, where they can and cannot relate in certain ways. What is important for these two individuals is that they know what their status means legally and what rights they have and do not have based on their status.

How can practitioners working with these communities and populations ensure people are aware of their status and understand what that status means in the legal sense? Effort is mandatory. Practitioners working with immigrant populations must make a conscious effort to help support and provide different resources to newcomers and immigrants so that they understand what immigration status they have. This can mean assisting them in navigating through their immigration documents and assisting them in contacting the necessary government agencies. Making an effort to and being actively involved in the self-research process for figuring out which immigration status one may have is an important step.

Based on this study, it is clear that there is a lack of information on what being a PR means and involves. While there is information on government websites, the language used is

not accessible in that it is in English and uses complex terminology. Perhaps the creation of pamphlets in different languages that are available in different locations (i.e. in Elementary school offices, churches, malls, etc.) will allow for people to access the information. In addition, Bill C-43, as illustrated in Jay and Abdoul's stories, is not a policy that is well known or understood as "common sense." While Trevor heard of the title of the Bill, he did not know that it involved PRs in Canada. Bringing awareness to this policy and encouraging newcomers to learn about what this policy means and to protect themselves from it is crucial.

It is clear that Bill C-43 works in such a way that re-creates and further categorizes "insiders" and "outsiders," thus echoing the colonial logics of exclusion. I believe that this Bill should be revoked as it is not just harmful to the lives of PRs in Canada, especially those who immigrated to Canada at a very young age, but also because it is another mechanism used to further marginalize groups constructed as the "other." As mentioned previously, to fully resist this harmful Bill, we must look at it as a mechanism that sustains and legitimizes the colonial state. For a PR to completely rid themselves of being subject to Bill C-43 is to obtain Canadian Citizenship. In many ways, obtaining Canadian citizenship, while it does protect PRs from Bill C-43, ultimately legitimizes the colonist state –a state that has borders and constructs "insiders" and "outsiders" and further separates "us" from "them." Gaining Canadian citizenship means being accepted into the "us" group, which requires newcomers to conform to the Canadian state. While this evokes feelings of confusion, tension and dilemma for myself personally, at the end of the day, I believe that no one should be displaced, and that there should be a place that each person can call as "home" where they do not experience fears of being forcibly removed from all they have known. With that said, gaining citizenship status is important, as it provides a

protection from the threat of redefining and challenging the meanings and realities of “place” and “home.”

In terms of the generalizability of this research, the findings presented and the conclusions drawn can be applied to different research and settings. For instance, the discussions surrounding the concepts of “home,” “place,” and belonging can inform current and future research pertaining to refugees. The complexities of place identity and attachment, as illustrated in this study, are also apparent within refugee populations but in different ways.

If given the opportunity to revisit this research with unlimited time and resources, I would definitely engage in a longitudinal study of Bill C-43 where data is collected from the early stages of the initial criminal sentence, to the deportation process, to the initial shock and adjustment to being deported to a place essentially “foreign,” ending with data collected from the life after facing the consequences of the policy as a whole. This type of study would extend over a period of many years, which would allow for a true account of what Bill C-43 means to PRs in Canada. Additionally, future steps with this research could involve a stronger focus on gender and the criminal justice system. Have women faced the consequences of Bill C-43? If so, how do their experiences differ? How are their experiences similar to men who have been impacted by this Bill? Another point of interest is the stigma stemming from one’s country of origin after being deported. What are the experiences of those who have been deported under Bill C-43 when they arrive in their birth country? Are they, once again, treated as “dangerous criminal others” who pose a threat to society? Does being a deportee carry with it marginalization, oppression, and/or unjust treatment after arrival? These are additional research questions of interest, and, in all, there are many different directions to go with this topic that would provide useful knowledge to the social justice field as a whole.

Breaking the Divide

Transformative change can only arise through mass mobilization led by populations most directly impacted by the harmful systems that distribute vulnerability and security. (Spade, 2011, p. 28).

For the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. (Lorde, 2007, p. 112)

In *Our Search For Belonging: How our need to connect is tearing us apart*, Howard J.

Ross (2018) states, "We have demonstrated a blind, and often terrifying willingness to go along with the crowd, even when the crowd is doing evil" (p.7). He calls for groups to connect with one another, make connections and build relationships to break the divide between "us" and "them" (Ross, 2018. p.7). An example of an organization who has successfully closed this gap is *No One is Illegal-Toronto*. While their main mandate is to focus on fighting for the rights of migrants, they state that they also commit to "support and build alliances with Indigenous peoples in their fight against colonialism, displacement and the ongoing occupation of their land" (NOIL, 2018). In the case of Abdoul, Black Lives Matter protested against his deportation, while highlighting the issues of race and immigration in Canada. In order to combat against harmful policies such as Bill C-43, we must come together as allies, break the divide that was created, and fight for the rights of one another while contesting the colonial logics of exclusion that continues to be echoed through the systems in place.

Works Cited

- Abdi v. Canada (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness)*, IMM-28-18, Canada: Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada, 13 July 2018, Retrieved from <https://ccla.org/cclanewsite/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/2018-06-18-FINAL-Memorandum-of-Argument-of-the-Intervener-CCLA-factum.pdf>
- Agnew, J. (2011). Space and place. In J. Agnew & D. Livingstone *The SAGE handbook of geographical knowledge* (pp. 316-330). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Akesson, B., Basso, A. R., & Denov, M. (2016). The right to home: domicide as a violation of child and family rights in the context of political violence. *Children & Society*, 30(5), 369-383.
- Akesson, B. (2014). 'We may go, but this is my home': Experiences of Domicide and Resistance for Palestinian Children and Families. *Journal of Internal Displacement*, 4(2), pp.8-22.
- Anderson, K., Campbell, M. & Belcourt, C. (2018). *Keestahnak: Our missing and murdered Indigenous sisters*. Edmonton, Alberta: The University of Alberta Press.
- Barnes, A. (2009). Displacing Danger: Managing Crime Through Deportation. *Journal of international migration and integration*, 10(4), 431-445.
- Bousquet, T. (2018, June 16). Breaking: Judge sets aside decision to deport Abdoul Abdi. *Halifax Examiner*. Retrieved from <https://www.halifaxexaminer.ca/featured/breaking-judge-sets-aside-decision-to-deport-abdoul-abdi/>
- Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, s 7, Part I of the Constitution Act, 1982, being Schedule B to the Canada Act 1982 (UK), 1982, c11.
- Canadian Council for Refugees (CCR) (2013). *Permanent Residents and Criminal Inadmissibility*. Retrieved from ccrweb.ca/criminality

- Chan, W. (2005). Crime, deportation and the regulation of immigrants in Canada. *Crime, law and social change*, 44(2), 153-180.
- Chan, W. & Chunn, D. (2014). *Racialization, Crime, and Criminal Justice in Canada*. North York, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.
- Comack, E. (2012). Chapter 3: Colonialism Past and Present. *Racialized Policing: Aboriginal People's Encounter with the Police*. pp.66-88.
- Comack, E. (2012). Racism and Othering. *Racialized Policing: Aboriginal People's Encounter with the Police*. pp.18-19.
- Comack, E. (2006). *Locating Law: Race/Class/Gender/Sexuality Connections* (2nd ed.). Blackpoint, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.
- Cresswell, T. (2004). *Place: A short introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Denov, M. & Akesson, B. (2013). Neither here nor there? Place and placemaking in the lives of separated children. *International Journal of Migration, Health and Social Care*, 9(2), pp.56-70.
- Dixon, J. & Durrheim, K. (2000). Displacing place-identity: a discursive approach to locating self and other. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39(1), pp.27-44.
- Geertz, C. (2008). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In *The Cultural Geography Reader* (pp. 41-51). Routledge.
- Goodale, R. [RalphGoodale] (2018, July 17). The Government of Canada respects the decision filed on July 13 by the Federal Court concerning Abdoul Abdi. The Government will not pursue deportation for Mr. Abdi [Twitter Moment]. Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/RalphGoodale/status/1019371039128674304>

- Goodreads. (2018). Maya Angelou Quotes. Retrieved from <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/189667-it-is-time-for-parents-to-teach-young-people-early>
- GraphicMaps (Cartographer). (2017, April 7). Map of Djibouti. [Topographic map]. Retrieved from <https://www.worldatlas.com/webimage/countrys/africa/dj.htm>
- Gustafson, G. (2014). Chapter 3: Place Attachment in an Age of Mobility. In *Place Attachment: Advances in Theory, Methods and Applications*. New York, NY: Routledge. pp.37-48.
- Hartley, J. (2004). Case study research. *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research, 1*, pp.323-333.
- Henry, F., Trator, C., Mattis, W., Rees, T. (1998). *The Colour of Democracy: Racism in Canadian Society*. Scarborough, ON: Nelson.
- Hing, B. (2006). *Deporting our Souls: Values, Morality, and Immigration Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Houghton, C., Casey, D., Shaw, D., & Murphy, K. (2013). Rigour in qualitative case-study research. *Nurse researcher, 20*(4).
- Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada. Admissibility Hearing Process. Retrieved from <https://irb-cisr.gc.ca/en/legal-policy/procedures/Pages/ProcessAdmEnq.aspx>
- Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, SC 2001, c 27, s 36(1) [“IRPA”]. Retrieved from <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/I-2.5/section-36.html>
- Johnson, W. (2006). *The Challenge of Diversity*. Succ. Place du Parc, Montreal: Black Rose Books.
- Jones, E. (2018, June 20). Immigration lawyers used a Sesame Street reference to argue that Abdoul Abdi should be deported to Somalia. *Halifax Examiner*. Retrieved from

<https://www.halifaxexaminer.ca/featured/immigration-lawyers-used-a-sesame-street-reference-to-argue-that-abdoul-abdi-should-be-deported-to-somalia/>

King, T. (2012). *The Inconvenient Indian: A curious account of native people in North America*. Canada: Anchor Canada.

Kohlbacher, F. (2006). The use of qualitative content analysis in case study research. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research Sozialforschung*, 1(21), pp.1-23.

Lewicka, M. (2014). Chapter 4: In search of roots: Memory as Enabler of Place Attachment. In *Place Attachment: Advances in Theory, Methods and Applications*. New York, NY: Routledge. pp.49-60.

Lorde, A. (2007). Chapter 12: The Master's Tools Will Dismantle the Master's House. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. pp.110-113.

Macklin, A. & Mandhane, R. (2012, November 26). Canada's new exiles. *Ottawa Citizen*. Retrieved from <https://www.law.utoronto.ca/news/prof-audrey-macklin-and-renu-mandhane-canada%E2%80%99s-new-exiles>

Maddux, C. (2000). Case Studies: Are we rejecting rigor or rediscovering richness? *Computers in the Schools*, 16(2), pp.13-16.

Manzo, L. C. (2003). Beyond house and haven: Toward a revisioning of emotional relationships with places. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 23, 47-61.

Mason, J. (2002). Designing Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Researching*, pp.26-47.

Mason, J. (2002). Qualitative Interviewing. *Qualitative Researching*, pp.82-83.

Massey, D. (1991). A global sense of place. *Marxism Today*, 35(6), pp. 24-9.

Matejova, M. (2017). I come from a world on a map. In *Wherever I find myself*. pp.26-29.

- Maurantonio, N. (2017). "Reason to Hope?": The White Savior Myth and Progress in "Post-Racial" America. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 94(4), 1130-1145.
- Mills, A. J., Durepos, G. & Wiebe, E. (Eds.) (2010). *Encyclopedia of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Muscatti, S. & Macklin, A. (2018, January 16). Abdoul Abdi case: A test of Canada's commitment to rules and compassion. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/abdoul-abdi-case-a-test-of-canadas-commitment-to-rules-and-compassion/article37616825/>
- No One Is Illegal-Toronto. (2018). About No One Is Illegal-Toronto. Retrieved from <https://toronto.nooneisillegal.org/about>
- Pace, N. (2018, February 14). 'It's really unfair': Abdoul Abdi's sister speaks out ahead of emergency hearing to stop deportation. *Global News*. Retrieved from <https://globalnews.ca/video/4026386/its-really-unfair-abdoul-abdis-sister-speaks-out-ahead-of-emergency-hearing-to-stop-deportation>
- Perkins, H. & Thorns, D. (2012). *Place, Identity & Everyday Life in a Globalized World*. Palgrave Macmillian.
- Pratt, A. (2005). *Securing Borders: detention and deportation in Canada*. Vancouver, B.C.: UBC Press.
- Proshansky, H. M., Fabian, A. K. & Kaminoff, R. (1983). Place-identity: physical world socialization of the self. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 3, pp.57-83.
- Rashid, A. (2018, March 21). Fight against racism by stopping the deportation of Abdoul Abdi. *NB Media Co-op*. Retrieved from <http://nbmediacoop.org/2018/03/21/fight-against-racism-by-stopping-the-deportation-of-abdoul-abdi/>

- Rishbeth, C. (2014). Chapter 8: Articulating Transnational Attachments through On-Site Narratives. In *Place Attachment: Advances in Theory, Methods and Applications*. New York, NY: Routledge. pp.100-111.
- Barton, R. (2018, January 25). Facing deportation: Abdoul Abdi's story. *The National*. Canada: CBC. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/player/play/1146293827809>
- Ross, H. & Tartaglione, (2018). *Our Search for Belonging: How our need to connect is tearing us apart*. Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Sadiq, S. (2017). Canada is my land. In *Wherever I find myself*. pp.110-111.
- Sampson, R. and Gifford, S.M. (2010). Place-making, settlement and well-being: the therapeutic landscapes of recently arrived youth with refugee backgrounds, *Health & Place*, 16(1), pp. 116-31.
- Scannell, L. & Gifford, R. (2014). Chapter 2: Comparing the theories of interpersonal and place attachment. In *Place Attachment: Advances in Theory, Methods and Applications*. New York, NY: Routledge. pp.23-36.
- Scourfield, J., Dicks, B., Drakeford, M., & Davies, A. (2006). *Children, Place and Identity: Nation and locality in middle childhood*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Seamon, D. (2014). Chapter 1: Place Attachment and Phenomenology: The synergistic dynamism of place. In *Place Attachment: Advances in Theory, Methods and Applications*. New York, NY: Routledge. pp.11-22.
- Spade, D. (2015). Introduction: Rights, Movements, and Critical Trans Politics. *Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, and the Limits of Law*. pp.20-48.
- Stabroek News. (2008, February 26). Fewer Guyanese will be admitted to Canada under the Skilled Workers category. *Stabroek News*. Retrieved from

<https://www.stabroeknews.com/2008/opinion/letters/02/26/fewer-guyanese-will-be-admitted-to-canada-under-the-skilled-workers-category/>

Stanley, T. (2012, August 21). John A. Macdonald wanted an 'Aryan' Canada. *The Ottawa Citizen*. CanWest Publications.

The Canadian Press. (2018, June 19). Judicial review set for today former child refugee Abdoul Abdi. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/article-judicial-review-set-for-today-former-child-refugee-abdoul-abdi/>

The Canadian Press. (2018, July 18). Abdoul Abdi relieved federal government won't pursue deportation: lawyer. *CTV News*. Retrieved from <https://www.ctvnews.ca/canada/abdoul-abdi-relieved-federal-government-won-t-pursue-deportation-lawyer-1.4017728>

Talaga, T. (2017). *Seven Fallen Feathers*. House of Anansi Press Inc.

Tuck, E., & Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2013). Curriculum, replacement, and settler futurity. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 29(1).

Tuck, E. & Yang, K.W. (2014). R-Words: Refusing Research. *Humanizing Research: Decolonizing Qualitative Inquiry with Youth and Communities*, pp.223-247

Wakenaam Island. (2013). Discover Wakenaam Island. Retrieved from

<http://wakenaamisland.com/>

Warner, J.A. (2005). The Social Construction of the Criminal Alien in Immigration Law, Enforcement Practice and Statistical Enumeration: Consequences for Immigrant Stereotyping. *Journal of Social and Ecological Boundaries*, 1(2), pp.56-80.

Williams, M. (2018a, January 17). How Canada's child welfare system fails refugees like Abdoul Abdi. *Maclean's*. Retrieved from <https://www.macleans.ca/opinion/how-canadas-child-welfare-system-fails-refugees-like-abdoul-abdi/>

Williams, M. (2018b, July 25). Abdoul Abdi will not be deported. But how much of a win is it, really? *Maclean's*. Retrieved from <https://www.macleans.ca/opinion/abdoul-abdi-will-not-be-deported-but-how-much-of-a-win-is-it-really/>