

sary, the whole of the Constitution to preserve the remainder.

Or, when I think of all the talk about co-operative federalism I am reminded of Heinrich Marx's famous remark about his illustrious son, Karl. He is reported as having said on one occasion:

If Karl, instead of writing so much about capital, would make some capital, things would be so much better.

I pass quickly now to another subject in which I am interested, and one to which Senator Roebuck referred. We are told that there are to be changes in our immigration laws. We are to have a White Paper. I hope this document will tackle the question a little more honestly than it has been tackled in the past. It is no secret that we have had immigration policies that have said one thing and have meant another, and I am quite aware of the difficulties at the present time.

Immigration into Canada is allowable in two broad categories. One, where there are family connections and where immigration is considerably freer, based on the theory that Canada does not want to be in the position of breaking up families. But the main category is one in which there is a test of job availability. We are told the purpose is to make sure that any prospective immigrant fits into the employment pattern in Canada. I think we would all agree this is something that has to be carefully watched. Unfortunately, in other countries they just do not believe that is the real reason for that test. We were told this in Jamaica over and over again. We were told of the embarrassment of our own officials in having to confront those who said that this is really just a way to "keep out blacks." And it is understandable if people feel that way, because the discrimination or the test, because it is against the unskilled, is therefore most applicable against the developing nations, and it so happens that most of the developing nations today are what we, for want of a better word, call "black".

There have been honest attempts to get around this. Canada entered into an undertaking with Jamaica not long ago to allow a certain number of female domestics to enter Canada. The intent was good in this case. The thought was: Here is an area of job availability, and we will take in 500—I think that was the number. This was completely misinterpreted in Jamaica, even though they had asked for it. What we heard was, "Under

your Canadian laws you have to be a domestic to get into the country." I say these difficulties arise because of this "double standard" in our immigration laws, and I for one would hope that the White Paper would face up to this and give us an honest assessment of our immigration policy, no matter how hard it may be for us or others to take.

I would like to say a word now about the suggestion in the Speech from the Throne that there will be legislation to facilitate—if I may use that word—the retirement of senators having reached a certain age. I have no strong views on this, except that from my experience here it seems to me that there is a danger of Senate reform being attacked from the wrong side, perhaps even from the wrong end. I need not mention names, but it is my own view that much of the area of the greatest worth of the Senate is to be found in the age group beyond the three score years and fifteen. If it is meant to be Senate reform, then I say somebody is not being very realistic. We have to face the fact that there is a demand across the country for some measure of Senate reform, and I use the term "reform" because that is the one currently in use. I have spoken to honourable senators about this and they have said, "Don't get worried about this, because this great outcry goes on every few years, and then it dies down."

I would like to suggest that this occasion may be different. If the Constitution is to be repatriated there is almost certainly going to be a constituent assembly of the provinces. I would say that in that constituent assembly the Constitution of Canada may well be examined section by section, paragraph by paragraph, and I would like to see somebody there to speak for the Senate. I would respectfully suggest to the Leader of the Government that it might be worth thinking about having a committee appointed, to consist of the wise men of the Senate, to face up to this problem and do a job of self-examination.

Is there any substance in this criticism? It is certainly not for me to say. Are we burying our heads in the sand? It is not for me to say. But I would like to see a committee of the Senate examine and analyze these criticisms, and recommend to this house what action should be taken by the Senate, if any action is necessary.

Finally, may I just make a comment on another matter that is suggested as the basis of legislation that will be introduced by the