

**Rainbow Refugee Committee Responds  
to Bill C-11 on Refugee Reform:  
Impact of Proposed Amendments to the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act  
on Refugee Claimants who have survived  
Sexual Orientation or Gender Identity Persecution**

Prepared For

Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration

May 2010



**RAINBOW REFUGEE COMMITTEE**  
1170 Bute St. Vancouver, BC V6E 1Z6 [info@rainbowrefugee.ca](mailto:info@rainbowrefugee.ca)

In Collaboration with

**LEGIT: Canadian Immigration for Same-Sex Partners**  
[www.legit.ca](http://www.legit.ca)



For further discussion of this document:

Sharalyn Jordan  
[info@rainbowrefugee.ca](mailto:info@rainbowrefugee.ca)

Christine Morrissey  
[vancouver@legit.ca](mailto:vancouver@legit.ca)

Rainbow Refugee is a community group formed in 2000 to support and advocate with refugees making claims based on sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI). Since 2001 we have worked directly with SOGI-based claimants, holding monthly, and now twice monthly, support and information meetings, accompanying claimants to hearings and liaising with settlement supports and lawyers. We have worked directly with many hundreds of refugees making SOGI based claims. To our knowledge, we are the only community group in Canada with this duration of direct experience focused on SOGI refugees. We draw on the seventeen year experience of LEGIT: Canadian Immigration for Same-Sex Partners in advocating, through non-partisan means, for fairness and equality for Lesbian Gay Bi Trans Queer (LGBTQ) people in immigration and refugee policies and practices. The perspectives and information presented in this response are a result of this direct work, as well as a review of legal and psychological literature related to SOGI-based refugee claims, and in-depth narrative interviews with Convention Refugees<sup>i</sup>.

We acknowledge the need for reforms to the refugee system, and welcome some of the proposals presented under Bill C-11 on Refugee Reform<sup>ii</sup>. However, we are deeply concerned that in an effort to create a more efficient refugee system, Bill C-11 may undermine the very features that protect the lives and human rights of people escaping all forms of persecution. We are particularly concerned about the impacts of the proposed reforms on those who face SOGI persecution. Further, we question whether some of these measures will in fact improve efficiency. This brief provides a background on the unique challenges for claimants and adjudicators in SOGI-based claims. We then present our concerns and recommendations on the specific provisions of Bill C-11.

### **International Context of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity based Persecution**

Refugee claimants making claims based on sexual orientation or gender identity (SOGI) have survived threatened or actual violence and pervasive stigma in their home countries. Rainbow Refugee members have fled countries where they have been under surveillance, arrested, imprisoned, extorted, and for some, tortured, because of their sexuality or gender identity. Currently no less than 80 countries criminalize same-sex sexual acts or gender transgressive behavior<sup>iii</sup>. Among these, five nations and two regions within nations maintain the death penalty for male homosexual acts and four for sexual acts between women. Outdated notions of mental illness are used to forcibly confine or subject people to questionable “treatment” including surgery. Public morality laws are used to penalize same-sex sexualities and gender variance. Laws prohibiting the “promotion of homosexuality” are used to inhibit political organizing.<sup>iv</sup> The existence of these laws creates a justification for violence and coercion of people whose behavior or appearance transgress normative genders or sexualities<sup>v</sup>.

Legal statutes tell only some of the story of homophobic and transphobic violence or persecution. Pervasive social intolerance, compounded by lack of state protection can make schools, neighborhoods, faith communities, and families sites of violent persecution. The experiences of some of our members demonstrate some of the range and complexity of SOGI-based persecution.<sup>1</sup>

In Sri Lanka there is a prison sentence for homosexuality. Although prison sentences are rarely applied, gay Sri Lankan men in Rainbow Refugee were detained by police. While in custody, they were physically, and in some cases sexually assaulted. They were forced to pay a bribe for their release. The police returned to their homes monthly to extort more money, threatening to out them or beat them if they did not pay.

A young woman from Nigeria was told to marry a man who was twenty years her elder. She confided in her sister that she was attracted to women and could not marry this man. The sister told her parents. The young woman was kept locked up and beaten regularly by her father for over a month. Rumours spread around her town and Church. When she was allowed out of her home, she was assaulted by a gang of young men and neighbors threw rocks at her. She was expelled from her Church.

A Colombian man spent ten years trying to hide and run from death threats from his family because they believed his gay sexuality disgraced them. Despite legal provisions protecting LGB people from discrimination, police refused to help him because his family had links to the drug cartels in Columbia.

A transwoman from Mexico was picked up by police while walking home in the afternoon. They threatened to charge her with prostitution if she did not perform sexual acts and pay them a bribe. Officers were regularly waiting outside her apartment, following and harassing her.

In a South Asian country that criminalizes homosexuality, a young man endured years of brutal physical abuse by his father and threats by others in his village. He moved to the capital city, where he had his first relationship with a man. An aunt reported them to police. The young man was under surveillance for a year, narrowly escaping arrest several times, before he was able to leave and come to Canada on a student visa.

A high school student in Iran was seen kissing her girlfriend. One of her classmates reported her to the Basiji, the religious police. The woman was taken into custody at night. She was forced to sign a confession and sentenced to death. She was held for six months. Prison guards sexually assaulted her. She was beaten, and prepared for her execution each week. Her parents paid a bribe for her release.

A woman from a South Asian country was beaten by her husband when he learned she was having an affair with another woman. She could not go to police for protection because the penal code in her country criminalizes homosexuality.

A man from one of the Gulf States came to Canada on a student visa. He planned to study and return. While in university he had a relationship with a man. Co-national students began

---

<sup>1</sup> All examples are of people found to be Convention Refugees. Some details have been modified or omitted to maintain confidentiality.

to suspect, and rumours spread. Someone contacted his family back home. His country of origin maintains the death penalty for same-sex acts.

These examples highlight some of the characteristics typical of SOGI-based persecution. First, surveillance and threat is dispersed along networks of family, school and community. The threat of violence and betrayal often comes from family, peers, or communities. Homophobic and transphobic violence often occurs in hidden contexts—unlike war or larger conflicts, people experience this violence in isolation. Religious teachings and psychiatric diagnosis are used to shame and pathologize people who live transgressive sexualities or genders. Stigmatization as “evil” or mentally ill further isolates and silences people.

Living under these conditions has long-standing impacts on people’s sexual or gender identity formation and mental health. To survive under these conditions people learn to deny, distance from, cover or hide their sexuality or transgressive gender. They learn to keep silent and stay vigilant. Stigmas limit the language people have for understanding their sexuality or gender, and make speaking about their sexuality or gender a fearful and shameful experience. The traumas experienced under these conditions are linked with stigma and relational betrayal—both of these factors have been associated with greater traumatic stress symptoms, including memory disturbance<sup>vi</sup>.

### **Refugee Protection for SOGI-based persecution: International Contexts**

The paths that people take to escape SOGI-based persecution are not the routes typical of refugees fleeing war, religious or ethnic conflict for a number of reasons. People living under homophobic or transphobic persecution often do not know that they have the option of seeking refugee protection. Sexual orientation and gender identity are not explicitly named as grounds for protection in the Geneva Convention<sup>vii</sup>. The fact that homophobia and transphobia can constitute persecution is often not apparent to those who have experienced it—even in extreme forms. Images of refugees as mass movements of people fleeing war work against people recognizing themselves as a potential refugee. Many of the people we have spoken with left their home countries with no more than a plan to get out, and only once they were in Canada learned of the refugee protection option.

Sometimes, it was only after living outside their home countries to work or study, and shedding some of the constraints they had lived with, that people claimed and more fully embodied an LGBTQ identity. In the process, they recognized the toll constraint had taken, and the impossibility of their return. Some were outed to local communities, or family back home, in ways that made returning dangerous.

Further, for those seeking safety from SOGI-based persecution, the protection offered at United Nations High Commission for Refugees may not be visible, accessible, or viable. The countries in which UNHCR offices are located are not necessarily safe for LGBTQ persons. Iranian LGBTQ refugees who have made claims at the UNHCR office in Ankara Turkey report high levels of threat and violence from local citizens and officials during their waiting period<sup>viii</sup>.

### **Refugee Protection for SOGI-Based Persecution: Canadian Context**

Since the early 1990s Canadian refugee practice and policies have enabled people fearing persecution related to sexual orientation or gender identity to become Convention Refugees in Canada<sup>ix</sup>. All refugee decisions are complex and hold life and death implications<sup>x</sup>. There are a number of factors that make SOGI-based claims particularly challenging.

1. Homophobic and Transphobic persecution is not as well researched or documented as other forms of persecution. The country condition documentation on SOGI-based persecution is sparse and inadequate. Frequently it is not precise enough for making refugee decisions where issues of Internal Flight or access to State Protection are an issue<sup>xi</sup>.
2. Providing a coherent account of events is particularly difficult given that SOGI-based claimants must provide testimony on extremely intimate, highly stigmatized, and typically hidden aspects of their lives<sup>xii</sup>.
3. Unlike other grounds for protection, no official guidelines for adjudicating SOGI refugee claims exist. The United Nations High Commission on Refugees released a guidance note in December 2008 as a preliminary effort to develop guidelines<sup>xiii</sup>. Board members often rely on implicit “common sense” knowledge. The work of legal scholars, and our own work have shown that this is inadequate. In many cases board members hold assumptions based on North American LGBTQ communities and identities that do not suit the realities of people from other cultures and contexts in which they have faced persecution.

Funding resettlement and increasing numbers of refugees that can be resettled from overseas is a positive step. However, such funding should not be considered an alternative to or trade-off for investing in a fair and effective Inland Refugee Determination Process. We firmly reject portrayals of asylum seekers in Canada as “less deserving” or “bogus” refugees, in comparison to “genuine”

refugees who wait in refugee camps overseas. Those who make these claims fail to recognize the realities of SOGI-based persecution and the challenges to accessing overseas refugee protection on these grounds. Resettlement and Inland Refugee Determination are complementary aspects of upholding Canada's commitment to protect those whose human rights, safety, and lives are at risk due to persecution.

### **Refugee Reform Bill C-11: Our concerns and recommendations**

Some aspects of Bill C-11 are promising. We welcome the long-awaited implementation of the Refugee Appeal Division. We agree with Bill C-11's goal of reducing the time claimants spend in uncertainty. We will be pleased to see concrete steps towards adequately funding the refugee determination process

However, in the effort to create a more efficient refugee system, critical measures for safeguarding the lives and human rights of potential refugees are eliminated or weakened in the provisions of Bill C-11. If the goal of the reforms is to create a system that is "Fair, Fast, Effective, Efficient, and Final"<sup>xiv</sup> Bill C-11 is weak on fair and effective, and is potentially no more efficient nor any faster than the current system. We focus on six issues of particular relevance to SOGI-based claims.

#### **1. Interview at Immigration and Refugee Board within Eight Days**

Under Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA), people make their case first to their lawyer or a settlement counsellor. This account is presented to the Immigration and Refugee Board (IRB) within 28 days. This allows claimants to give their first detailed account at their own pace in a fairly neutral space.

Under C-11 amendments, refugee claimants will be interviewed by government officials within 8 days of making their claim. S. 11(2), replacing IRPA 100(4). Also S. 20, amending IRPA 161(1) re. issuance of rules.

#### **Concerns:**

- 1.1. Eight days is not enough time for people to obtain and meet with a lawyer. Bill C-11 does not provide details of the length or scope of the interview, but we are concerned that substantial decision-making weight may rest on information provided by unprepared claimants.
- 1.2. People who have lived a stigmatized identity, need time and trust before they can speak about their experiences. More so than any other grounds, SOGI claims require applicants to provide details about highly stigmatized, intimate and frequently traumatic aspects of their lives. The impacts of internalized homophobia—the fear and shame of living under persecution, and

stigma—do not disappear on arrival in Canada. One Rainbow Refugee member stayed in detention for twenty-seven days before working up the nerve to tell the duty counsel that he was gay. Without adequate time or trust, applicants may leave out information that is critical to their case because shame or fear prevent them from speaking about their experience. We are worried that claimants will be unfairly prejudiced under these conditions.

- 1.3. The time frame fails to accommodate claimants who are vulnerable due to Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). For the significant number of SOGI based claimants who have experienced physical or sexual violence, interactions with officials may trigger intense anxiety, to a degree that interferes with memory, and the ability to produce a coherent narrative<sup>xv</sup>. The Immigration and Refugee Board's Guideline on Procedures with Respect to Vulnerable Persons (Guidelines 8) calls for procedural accommodations for vulnerable people, including survivors of torture or sexual violence. However, the Guideline depends upon claimants being identified as vulnerable – something that could not happen within 8 days. Holding an initial interview within eight days in a government building risks retraumatizing claimants. Physical surroundings that suggest detention, jail, police or officials carry associations of past traumas for many SOGI claimants. All claimants should have the opportunity to be assessed for PTSD prior to providing any testimony that determines their final decision.

**Recommendation:**

- 1.1 Delete the Eight-day interview from the law.

**2. Legislating a 60 day time-frame in which to hold hearings.**

**Concerns:**

- 2.1 A fair hearing requires good quality evidence, yet the sixty-day time line is inadequate time for claimants to gather documents. Proving a sexuality that people have kept secret in order to survive is extremely challenging. Documenting sexuality-based claims requires retrieving hospital, police and court records from other countries. Obtaining and translating these documents typically takes claimants several months. LGB claimants require letters from former partners who are often reluctant to write an official letter naming their own sexuality. Proving a gender-identity based claim requires providing extensive psychological and medical reports. Two months is simply not enough time for claimants to produce documentation. This will seriously compromise the quality of evidence claimants will be able to provide.
- 2.2 Without these forms of corroborating documents, greater weight will rely on the verbal testimony of claimants, Yet the 60 day time-line leaves little time for people to build confidence in speaking openly about their sexuality or gender identity or to begin the process of healing from trauma. The emotional numbing and difficulties remembering undermined their ability to give strong testimony—we have seen this work against LGBT claimants. We fear the vast majority of SOGI-based claimants will be inadequately prepared for hearings, resulting in poor decisions and unfair refusals. We know LGBT people who have been sent back to serious harm when members did not believe they were gay or lesbian.
- 2.3 Holding hearings with insufficient evidence will result in more appeals. This undermines the goal of faster processing times—increasing costs and leaving claimants in uncertainty longer.

**Recommendation:**

- 2.1 Schedule hearings taking into account when they will be ready to proceed.

2.2 Both the eight-day interview and the 60-day time line for hearings are provisions designed to reduce processing times. We fully support efforts to reduce the time claimants spend waiting in uncertainty. The current wait times of 19 months is absolutely unacceptable. However, legislating time-lines is not the best mechanism for reducing processing times. Properly resourcing the Refugee System will go a long way towards reducing wait times. According to the report of the Auditor General, the current 62,000 case backlog is a result of failing to staff the IRB adequately<sup>xvi</sup>. The timelines for Bill C-11 are entirely unrealistic.

### **3. Undermining independence of first instance decision makers.**

Under C-11, first instance decision-makers would be civil servants, rather than Governor-in-Council (GIC) appointees. Members of the Refugee Appeal Division (RAD) would be appointed by Cabinet (i.e. GIC appointees). S. 26, adding IRPA s. 169.1

#### **Concerns:**

3.1 We agree with need for reform in the selection and retention of IRB members, but are concerned that provisions under C-11 undermine the independence of decision-makers. This independence is fundamental to fair and effective refugee decisions. The recent appointment to the IRB of a member who has campaigned against basic rights for LGBT people underlines the importance of insulating the appointment and retention process from political influence<sup>xvii</sup>.

#### **Recommendations:**

3.1 Amend IRPA to enable the Chairperson of the IRB to make appointments. These appointments should be longer fixed terms.

### **4. Limits on the timing and scope of Humanitarian and Compassionate applications**

Provisions in C-11 prevent Claimants from filing an H & C application while their claim is pending and for 12 months following rejection. S. 4(1) (amending IRPA 25(1)), also S. 3 (amending IRPA 24 barring application for Temporary Residence Permit (TRP)).

Provisions in C-11 also state that Sections 96 and 97 factors cannot be considered in H&C applications. S. 4(1), amending IRPA 25(1) to add new clause. This amendment would prevent the consideration within an H&C application of the factors that are taken into account in the determination of whether a person is a Convention refugee (section 96) or a person in need of protection (section 97 – risk of torture or cruel and unusual treatment, and risk to life).

#### **Concerns:**

4.1 Humanitarian and Compassionate consideration is an important means of protecting people who face risk and hardship, but whose circumstances do not meet the narrow definition of a Convention Refugee (96) or person in need of protection (97). This is often the case for people fleeing homophobic or transphobic violence in countries where protection for LGBT persons is uneven and hard to access. Preventing humanitarian reasons from being considered will result in people being sent back to very real harms.

This provision places those leaving conditions of transphobic or homophobic intolerance in the double bind of having to determine before making a refugee claim whether their experience constitutes persecution. This determination is the job of the refugee protection system. Trained lawyers and adjudicators struggle to make this determination—ordinary people should not be placed in a forced choice situation when they cannot understand the issues fully. Those



who do not meet this threshold of persecution should still have the opportunity to have their situation reviewed for humanitarian and compassionate consideration.

- 4.2 It is impossible to separate out section 96 and 97 from issues of hardship and compassion. A lesbian made an application on H&C grounds when her refugee claim was denied. She had family and work here in Canada and also faced extreme forms of social marginalization in her country of origin. Under C-11 she would face the dilemma of whether to mention the discrimination she faced because it might rise to the level of persecution.

### **Recommendations:**

- 4.1 Delete amendments barring access to H&C for claimants.
- 4.2 Delete proposed amendment adding IRPA 25 (1.3) (provision excluding sections 96 and 97 factors from H&C decisions).
- 4.3 Consider giving the IRB jurisdiction to accept a claimant based on H&C considerations.

### **5. Implementation of the Refugee Appeal Division**

Given the complexity of refugee decisions, and our experience with unfairly rejected claimants the need for a full merits based appeal has been clear for a long time. We welcome the full implementation of the Refugee Appeal Division.

### **Concerns:**

- 5.1 We anticipate many problems arising from limiting appeals to consideration of new evidence, or evidence that could not reasonably be expected to be available. Much time and energy will go into determining what is and is not admissible.
- 5.2 Further, it appears that the Ministers Representative is given latitude to present all evidence, while the claimants are limited to new or previously unavailable evidence.

### **Recommendations:**

- 5.3 Allow the appeal to consider all relevant evidence.

### **6. Designated “safe” countries of origin**

Bill C-11 would empower the Minister to designate countries whose nationals would not have access to the refugee appeal. The bill also allows the Minister to designate one part of a country or a class of nationals from a country. (S. 12, adding new IRPA 109.1.) This effectively creates a two-tier refugee determination system based on country of origin.

### **Concerns:**

- 6.1 This provision undermines the principle of equality before the law. Denying access to a full process based on country of origin alone undermines fairness.
- 6.2 The Bill lacks specificity as to the criteria and process for designating a country. Although Citizenship and Immigration Canada’s background paper refers to “safe countries of origin”, neither

the word “safe” nor any criteria are included in Bill C-11. The designated list provision is fraught with potential to politicize refugee determination.

6.3 Designating an entire country or a class of nationals does not take into account the complexity, variability and flux that exists for LGBT persons safety and rights. Extreme forms of homophobic and transphobic violence often co-exist with constitutional protection for LGBT people on paper, particularly in newer democracies. For example in South Africa same-sex marriages are recognized, yet human rights organizations report that “corrective rape” of lesbians largely goes unpunished<sup>xviii</sup>. We have heard Bogota described by one man as a great place to be gay, and by another, who spent ten years on the move within Colombia trying to escape death threats, as a terrifying city to be gay. The first was protected by his affluence; the second was vulnerable due to being rural and poor. We have seen that within the same country of origin, access and viability of state protection varies considerably based on a person’s social class, gender, race and social networks.

6.3 Sufficient objective and up to date information on the conditions for LGBT persons is not available for many countries. It would be perilously easy to designate a country “safe” based on inaccurate or insufficient information about the on the ground realities for LGBT persons.

For example, Mexico is raised as a likely candidate for the designated list, because of the surge in claims coming from Mexico in 2008, many of them unfounded. Yet, the on the ground conditions for LGBT persons in Mexico is fluid, and varies dramatically by region, and by an individuals’ social status. Despite recognition of same-sex marriage within Mexico City, local and state laws continue to be used to penalize LGBT persons. Transpersons are not protected in the constitution. We have witnessed hearings for Trans claimants from Mexico in which there has been some confusion about country conditions for Trans, as compared to LGB, persons. Lesbians may have difficulty accessing state protection because of the prevailing Machismo. Race and class impact access to protection. This makes deciding whether Internal Flight and State Protection is viable extremely complex. Individualized decision-making is needed, and the safety net of an appeal is critical to fairness. It is precisely when countries are nominally safe that refugee protection decisions are most complex.

6.4 We are wary of the reassurance that a class of Nationals can be designated when a country cannot be designated. Does this mean that LGBT persons from a country could have access to an appeal while other nationals of the same country do not? This provision would seem to create an incentive for fraudulent LGBT claims. This does not serve the refugee determination system or LGBT claimants.

6.5 Countries that have designated safe country lists do not necessarily have more efficient refugee systems.

### **Recommendation:**

6.1 Remove all provisions related to the designated country list.

6.2 The designated country list was proposed as a means to deal with occasional sudden surges in claims from source countries that are not typically refugee producing. There are alternative mechanisms for dealing with this issue that do not create the problematic two-tier refugee system.

6.3 Create provisions for the Minister of Public Safety (CBSA) to identify a limited number of claims that the IRB would be required to hear on a priority basis. These should be designated on a

case-by-case basis. This is both more fair and more practical than a designated country list, or the current de facto practice in which the IRB prioritizes some types of claims, compromising their independent and unbiased stance in the process. As the agency responsible for enforcement, CBSA is in a better position to know which claims to expedite. Limiting the number of claims that can be expedited will encourage the CBSA to conduct thorough analysis and prioritize their requests.

6.4 Provide sufficient resources to CBSA to enforcement removals after the appeal process is complete.

6.5 Having recognized the role of organized crime in creating these surges, focus efforts on investigating and disrupting these links. Anti-trafficking policies and practices assist these investigations.

## **Conclusion**

Living our sexuality and gender identity safely, with dignity and respect is an intrinsic right. As LGBT persons around the World mobilize for justice in their own countries, greater recognition and protection of our rights will result. At the same time, a backlash may be underway<sup>xix</sup>. With visibility comes greater risk. Canada has a critical role to play in providing a place of safety for those whose lives, safety and rights are at risk due to persecution of their Sexual Orientation or Gender Identity. We urge the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration to be cognizant that their decisions on Bill C-11 have consequences for the lives and Human Rights of all potential refugees, and to recognize the particular challenges of LGBT refugee claimants. We conclude with key principles of a fair, effective, fast and efficient refugee system that will serve to protect those making SOGI based claims.

- Good, independent decision makers. Recognize the importance of selecting and retaining decision makers in a manner that retains their independence, and train them well. Invest in developing training and guidelines on SOGI based claims.
- Fair hearings. Recognize the high level of trauma and stigma that SOGI based claimants may have experienced, and the ways that it may interfere with interacting with officials. Recognize that the conditions under which claimants provide testimony impacts the quality of evidence they are able to provide. Ensure that protocols for vulnerable persons can be followed at each step of the process.
- Equal access. Accord each claimant equal access to a hearing and an appeal. Refugee decisions should never rest in the hands of a single individual.
- Recognize that homophobic and transphobic violence and social intolerance are complex, changing and cause very real harms. Invest in gathering good country condition evidence. Allow consideration of Humanitarian and Compassionate grounds when there are potential risks that do not meet the definition for Convention Refugee protection.



### Authors of the Brief

**Rainbow Refugee Committee** is a Vancouver based community group that supports and advocates with refugee claimants who have fled persecution based on sexual orientation or gender identity (SOGI). Founded in 2000, we are the first organization in Canada to focus on Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Queer (LGBTQ) refugee issues. In 2003 Rainbow Refugee Committee and its sister organization LEGIT were jointly honoured by the BC Human Rights Coalition for their work on LGBT immigration and refugee issues.

**Chris Morrissey** started her advocacy work on immigration and refugee issues that impact LGBT people in 1992 when she challenged Canada's exclusion of same-sex relationships from family sponsorship in federal court. As one of the founding members of LEGIT *Canadian Immigration for Same-Sex partners* in 1992 and Rainbow Refugee Committee in 2000 she has worked tirelessly for recognition and fairness for LGBTQ people seeking refugee protection or family reunification in Canada. As a community development worker in Canada she has worked with women leaving domestic violence and LGBT elders.

**Sharalyn Jordan** began working on LGBTQ immigration and refugee issues in 2000 when LEGIT helped her with a same-sex partner application. She has volunteered with LEGIT since 2001 and Rainbow Refugee Committee since 2004. She is a PhD candidate in Counselling Psychology at University of British Columbia conducting research on the settlement of refugees who make their claims based on Sexual Orientation or Gender Identity.

Rainbow Refugee Committee and Sharalyn Jordan have collaborated to conduct a community-based investigation of refugee settlement for those making inland claims based on sexual orientation or gender identity. This research was supervised by scholars at University of British Columbia and Simon Fraser University: Drs Marla Buchanan, Mary Bryson, and Cindy Patton. Preliminary findings will be published in an upcoming issue of *Refuge*.

- 
- <sup>i</sup> Jordan, SR. (2010). Un/Convention(al) Refugees: Accounts of escape and exile from homophobic and transphobic persecution. *Refuge: Canada's periodical on refugees*. Accepted for publication.
- <sup>ii</sup> March 30, 2010. Bill C-11 Balanced Refugee Reform to Amend the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act. Retrieved from [www2.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?Language=E&Parl=40&Ses=3&Mode=1&Pub=Bill&Doc=C11\\_1](http://www2.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?Language=E&Parl=40&Ses=3&Mode=1&Pub=Bill&Doc=C11_1)
- <sup>iii</sup> Ottoson, Donald. (2009). "State-Sponsored Homophobia: A World Survey of Laws Prohibiting Same Sex Activity between Consenting Adults." Retrieved from [www.ilga.org/news\\_results.asp?](http://www.ilga.org/news_results.asp?)
- <sup>iv</sup> Secretariat, A. I. (2008). Love, hate and the law: Decriminalizing homosexuality. (Report). Retrieved from [www.amnesty.org/en/library/info](http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info)
- <sup>v</sup> Ottoson, Donald. (2009). "State-Sponsored Homophobia: A World Survey of Laws Prohibiting Same Sex Activity between Consenting Adults." Retrieved from [www.ilga.org/news\\_results.asp?](http://www.ilga.org/news_results.asp?)
- <sup>vi</sup> Birrell, P & Freyd, J. Betrayal Trauma: Relational Models of Harm and Healing. *Journal of Trauma Practice*. 5 (1).
- <sup>vii</sup> United Nations Convention (1951) and Protocol (1967) Related to Refugees. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/protect/PROTECTION/3b66c2aa10.pdf>
- <sup>viii</sup> Grungras, N., Levitan, R., & Slotek, A. (2009). Unsafe Haven: Security Challenges Facing LGBT Asylum Seekers and Refugees in Turkey. *PRAXIS The Fletcher Journal of Human Security*, 14.
- <sup>ix</sup> LaViolette, N. (2007). Gender-related Refugee Claims: Expanding the scope of the Canadian Guidelines. *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 19(2), 1-47.
- <sup>x</sup> Rousseau, C., Crepeau, F., Foxem, P. , & Houle, F. . (2002). The complexity of determining refugeehood: A multidisciplinary analysis of the decision-making process of the Canadian Immigration and Refugee Board. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 15(1), 43-70.
- <sup>xi</sup> LaViolette, N. (1994). No Safe Haven: Sexuality as a universal human right and lesbian and gay activism in international politics. *Millenium:Journal of International Studies*, 563-588.
- <sup>xii</sup> Jordan (2010) Un/Convention(al) Refugees: Accounts of escape and exile from homophobic and transphobic persecution. *Refuge: Canada's periodical on refugees*. Accepted for publication.

and Berg, L., & Milbank, J. (2009). Constructing the personal narratives of lesbian, gay and bisexual asylum claimants. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 22(1).

- <sup>xiii</sup> UNHCR, (November 21, 2008). *Guidance note on refugee claims relation to sexual orientation and gender identity*. ; LaViolette, N. (2009). *An Analysis of the UNHCR's Guidance Note on Refugee Claims Relating to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity*. *American Society of International Law*, 13(10). Retrieved from: [www.asil.org/insights090730.cfm](http://www.asil.org/insights090730.cfm)
- <sup>xiv</sup> Showler, P. (2009, September). *Fast, Fair and Final: Reforming Canada's Refugee System*. Retrieved from: [www.maytree.com/spotlight/fast-fair-and-final.html](http://www.maytree.com/spotlight/fast-fair-and-final.html)
- <sup>xv</sup> Van Der Kolk, B. A. (1998). Trauma and memory. *Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, 52(5), 97-109.
- <sup>xvi</sup> Auditor General of Canada. (2009, March) Status Report of the Auditor General of Canada, Chapter 2—The Governor in Council Appointment Process, [http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl\\_oag\\_200903\\_02\\_e\\_32289.html](http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_oag_200903_02_e_32289.html) Auditor General's report
- <sup>xvii</sup> Thompson, E. (March 17 2009) Anti-Gay Appointment to the Refugee Board. *Toronto Sun*. Retrieved from [www.torontosun.com/news/canada/2009/03/17/8774856-sun.html](http://www.torontosun.com/news/canada/2009/03/17/8774856-sun.html)
- <sup>xviii</sup> Kelly, A. (March 12, 2009) Raped and Killed for being a lesbian: South Africa Ignores Corrective Attacks. Retrieved from [www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/mar/12/eudy-simelane-corrective-rape-south-africa](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/mar/12/eudy-simelane-corrective-rape-south-africa)
- <sup>xix</sup> Ottoson, Donald. (2009). "State-Sponsored Homophobia: A World Survey of Laws Prohibiting Same Sex Activity between Consenting Adults." Retrieved from [www.ilga.org/news\\_results.asp?](http://www.ilga.org/news_results.asp?)