

*Adjournment Debate*

She has provided an example to all Canadians through her commitment to duty and service. Many countries have people to point to as national symbols. They are not necessarily heads of state and they are not necessarily people one would be proud to know. Elizabeth II, through the virtues and values she brings to her life and work, is someone we are proud to be associated with and proud to have as our head of state.

Some Hon. Members might feel that commissioning a statue of a monarch still living is not particularly appropriate. In the case of our Prime Ministers, statues have been erected long after their deaths. It often takes a few years before hindsight allows for impartial appreciation of someone's contribution to our national development. In the case of the Queen, there is no need to wait. The Queen has served this country longer than any other monarch. She has meant more to Canadians than any other and has more than earned the honour we have the authority to bestow in creating a statue here on Parliament Hill.

**Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say a few words in support of Motion M-135, that the Government consider the advisability of commissioning a statue for Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II here on Parliament Hill.

In so doing, I recognize that Canada has been a constitutional monarchy from the time of its inception. Kings and queens have been part of our history for as long as that history has been written. However, what sets this monarch apart is that in 1953 she was declared by Parliament and the Government as the first Queen of Canada.

The Fathers of Confederation deliberately chose our form of constitutional monarchy, having the American example before it. Those were difficult times, but also a time of new beginnings. They could have chosen to reject the monarchy if they had preferred to do so, but in the words of Sir John A. Macdonald: "Our first act is to recognize the sovereignty of Her Majesty".

From that time, and even more significantly from 1953, when Elizabeth was specifically named Queen of Canada, the sovereignty of Her Majesty and the sovereignty of this country have been linked as one and the same.

The Queen is the head of the Canadian state, with powers and authorities under our Constitution as a constitutional monarch. She has administered those affairs with dignity and responsibility. She has, at times, remonstrated with her First Ministers and has given them cautious, careful and prudent guidance.

Although this form of Government is often misunderstood and often subject to criticism as not being democratic, this system is, in fact, one of the most stable, democratic and least costly of any system of government in modern political science.

The Queen has been enormously successful as an institution in government. We do not talk of a kingdom in this country.

The people of Canada know that Parliament is supreme. We see no threat in Her Majesty, but we see her as part of our heritage, from whose predecessors Parliament won the right of government.

We see her as a person, conducting the affairs of the monarchy, as she is called upon to do from time to time, with the utmost of grace and dignity.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member but he will have six minutes remaining in his speech the next time the Bill comes before the House.

The hour provided for consideration of Private Members' Business is now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 36(2), the order is dropped to the bottom of the list of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

---

## PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 66 deemed to have been moved.

### STATUS OF WOMEN—COURT CHALLENGE TO LANGUAGE TRAINING POLICY/MINISTER'S POSITION

**Ms. Marion Dewar (Hamilton Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to a question I asked in November concerning the Government's language policy for immigrant women. This is not a new question, but one which was identified in the 1960s, the 1970s and again in the 1980s. Over 50 per cent of immigrant women do not have access to language training.

The policy is that those who are about to have access to the job market or are seen as the head of the family are the ones who are eligible for language training. This is not effective. We know that what it is doing is making immigrant women, particularly those from Third World and Asian countries, ghettoized into low-paying jobs and poor working conditions. There now has been a colloquium of groups that have decided to launch legal action against the federal Government on its language policy. It seems to me we are just putting the well-being of lawyers as a priority rather than having a true policy for these immigrant women.

● (1800)

It has been identified as a problem over the years, and I think it would be quite simple if the Government could change its policy at this point in time. I am not suggesting that this would not be costly. Of course, it costs money to eliminate discrimination. However, we must look at the input of the Government with respect to adult immigrant women in particular. We did not educate them. We did not raise them. They were not part of any kind of liability on our health care system. Therefore, they have arrived here, and have become