

when this act received a substantial overhauling we continued to maintain that kind of discrimination in a statute of this country with respect to citizenship. Of course the minister has indicated that this is one of the measures which will effectively be set aside and that citizenship will be passed on by either male or female Canadian subjects. I believe that in that mood we must certainly welcome it, and can only regret that it has taken so long for action to begin on such a basic aspect of human rights. It is also appropriate that this action will be taken this year which is regarded as International Women's Year. Perhaps it is one of the more tangible things that has been done by way of legislation in the House.

There have been some other measures considered, but I have not received the impression that the government's momentum with respect to rights, legal rights for women, has been given much of an examination and much forward motion with regard to activity in the House. I do not know what future plans are afoot with respect to the examination of other statutes, but I hope that the minister and his officials, perhaps in consultation with the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Lalonde), have urged very strongly on the Law Reform Commission that it continue to examine our laws to pinpoint in what ways they may still create a situation of continuing inequality for women.

International Women's Year has undoubtedly been a mixed blessing, in my estimation. It has focused much more consciously the thoughts of all citizens on the ways in which we have built procedures and traditions of discrimination into our social system. But the temptation in having a women's year as such is to think that when we reach December 31 all actions that are necessary to take will have concluded. I think that is not obviously the case. I say that because I have had another matter that I have raised with the minister which also relates to the legislation we have in front of us.

It is a matter that has received a fair amount of publicity, at least in the Ottawa newspapers because it involved a former citizen of this country and of Ottawa, who found to her surprise, shock, and eventual sorrow that she had lost her citizenship after being incorrectly informed by officials of either the Department of the Secretary of State or of the Department of Manpower and Immigration, but certainly an official of the government.

Perhaps again I should relate this as an aspect which I am not sure will be satisfactorily resolved under the proposals that are before us. I wrote to the minister on September 19 of this year indicating that a Mrs. Michele Beach, formerly Robert, born in Canada and married to someone from Great Britain, because of certain misinformation lost her Canadian citizenship. The story was as follows: in 1972 while living in Canada, and before her marriage to Mr. Beach, Miss Robert inquired of the Department of the Secretary of State and Department of Manpower and Immigration if she would lose her Canadian citizenship by marrying a citizen of the United Kingdom. She was reassured that, no, she would not lose her citizenship but would, in fact, enjoy a dual one; Canadian and United Kingdom.

After their marriage the young couple moved to England for a couple of years before intending to settle permanently in Canada. Mrs. Beach again checked that by leaving

### *Citizenship*

Canada she would not lose her citizenship. Again the answer was, correctly, no.

In Britain she decided to formalize her dual citizenship status by formally registering as a United Kingdom citizen. Continually fearing a loss of Canadian citizenship, Mrs. Beach inquired of the British Home Office officials. They informed her that formal registration as a citizen of the United Kingdom would cause people of many countries to lose their original citizenship, but that that particular ruling did not apply to Canada; her Canadian status would be O.K. So naturally she went ahead with the process and was granted U.K. citizenship on July 12, 1974.

● (1750)

In August of 1974 the Canadian High Commission contacted her stating that as she was officially registered as a citizen of the United Kingdom, she was no longer a Canadian citizen, and would be required to surrender her Canadian passport and certificate of Canadian citizenship. The upset this must have created for Mrs. Beach can be imagined. After that she and her husband went frequently to Canada House in protest. The officials there agreed to look into the matter, and on August 28 of last year the second secretary for consular affairs advised Mrs. Beach to take formal steps to renounce her U.K. citizenship in order that her Canadian one would still be valid. Accepting that advice, on September 4 she did just that.

Unfortunately, this second mistake was brought home to her on December 30 when the registrar in the Canadian citizenship registration branch of the department wrote Mrs. Beach explaining that her renunciation of U.K. citizenship made absolutely no difference. She was still not a Canadian citizen, and would not be until she had established residence in Canada for one year. In fact at this point she was stateless along with being, I imagine, almost speechless.

Mrs. Beach has since had her U.K. citizenship reinstated because it would be impossible for her to continue in that situation for any length of time. The difficulties which would immediately be created for her can be imagined. However, obviously her basic desire is to regain her Canadian citizenship. She has made a number of appeals, and even came to Ottawa during the past summer to make personal calls on government officials to plead her case.

In this instance I wrote to see if this was not a case where the minister, through an order in council, could restore a citizenship where obviously in the situation she had received a good deal of misinformation from two Canadian government departments, and in this case also from the United Kingdom department. I want to read the letter I received from the Secretary of State (Mr. Faulkner) with respect to this very human problem because it seems to me that this is the very kind of thing the minister should be conscious of in bringing this legislation forward. His letter is dated November 4, 1975, and it reads as follows:

I refer to your letter of September 19 regarding Mrs. Michele Beach (née Robert) whose status under the Canadian Citizenship Act has received recent publicity.

Since the Canadian Citizenship Act came into force on January 1st, 1947, a Canadian woman does not lose her Canadian citizenship by marriage to a citizen of another country. However, any Canadian not under a disability (i.e. as to age or mental competence) who, by a