

the estimates. Concerning this particular refreshment, as they call it, which started in 1981, the first contribution from Canada of \$147 million in that year was done by that historic method, which had been carried on for a number of years and was followed by both the previous Conservative and Liberal governments. However, in 1981 the Speaker of the House of Commons ruled that it was inappropriate to make those expenditures through \$1 items in the estimates and, as a result, legislation was brought forward for the 1982 advance of \$164 million. That was authorized by Bill C-71, as an amendment to the original act.

We now have before us Bill C-129, which covers the remaining contribution which Canada must make during 1983 of \$260 million. I mention this in order that honourable senators will understand the reason for the amount of \$601.81 million referred to in the bill. That amount covers the whole three-year replenishment, including the amount paid out in 1981, the amount paid out in 1982 under Bill C-71 following the Speaker's ruling, and the amount now required to be paid out. Those three amounts total the figure referred to in the present bill. When a subsequent replenishment is necessary, a further bill will have to be brought before Parliament.

Honourable senators, I do not believe that I need stress the importance to the stability of the world of the successful operation of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, and also the importance to Canada, one of the great trading nations of the world, of a stable world trading system, which is so greatly assisted by funds such as those from the IDA. I merely mention that for the record, but I know that all honourable senators are in agreement with Canada's support of those agencies.

That concludes my general remarks, and I now turn to the bill itself. As I mentioned, it is a brief bill. Clause 1 is exactly the same as that contained in the original Bretton Woods Agreements Act, which is in the last revision of the Statutes of Canada. I cannot remember the year in which it was actually passed, but I believe it was 1946 or 1947. The words added in clause 1—and this is a legal nicety—are “and exercising any rights”. Apparently it was decided that subscribing our share to the bank by purchasing our 7.5 per cent or 10 per cent of the authorized share capital is a right rather than an obligation. I would hope that we will treat it as an obligation as well as a right; but that is the reason for the addition of those words.

In clause 2, the word “subscription” has been changed to the word “subscriptions”. It says:

—subscriptions required or permitted from Canada, that is to say, two billion, one hundred and seventy-eight million—

That is the cumulative total since the beginning of the Bretton Woods Agreement. I might say that those moneys are arrived at in Canadian dollars that are converted to 1944 American dollars.

**Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Is that in gold? It says “weight and fineness”.

[Senator van Roggen.]

**Senator van Roggen:** The reason for the reference to “weight and fineness” is that the Americans were then on the gold standard. They are not any more and “fineness” does not really apply. It is not a conversion to 1944 dollars allowing for inflation. It is only a conversion to 1944 American dollars as a constant, as between the values of different moneys in the world. Today our dollar is calculated at 1.48 Canadian for the American dollar in 1944. I assume that the Swiss would be less than par after so many years, their currency having increased against the American currency. So it is not an inflation conversion.

If, for the sake of argument, our dollar today is 20 per cent below par, if we calculate it all the way back to 1944 it is 48 cents below; so that today the conversion factor is \$1.47 or \$1.48.

Clause 3 refers to the International Development Association Act passed in 1960. Again honourable senators will see that subsection 2(2) is amended only by making this reference to an exercise of rights as opposed to an obligation.

In clause 4 there is reference to a sum of “six hundred and one million, eight hundred and ten thousand dollars”. That is the amount which I tried to describe in my general remarks as being Canada's portion of the refreshment for this current three-year period, part of which was paid out in 1981 by a \$1 item, and part of which was paid out in 1982 under the previous bill. The balance is now covered under the present bill. This sum covers all three of those sums.

● (1520)

Honourable senators, I think that concludes any remarks that I have of a general nature relative to the bill. I shall be pleased to endeavour to answer any questions that you may have.

On motion of Senator Asselin, debate adjourned.

## INDIAN-INUIT WEEK BILL

### SECOND READING—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Williams, seconded by the Honourable Senator Adams, for the second reading of the Bill S-28, intituled: “An Act establishing Indian-Inuit Week and Inuit-Indian Day”.—(*Honourable Senator Frith*).

**Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government):** Stand.

**Hon. Jacques Flynn (Leader of the Opposition):** Honourable senators, since Senator Williams, the sponsor of Bill S-28, is no longer a member of the Senate, this order should be discharged if no one takes his place.

**Senator Frith:** Honourable senators, I think it is a good suggestion that, if no one wishes to take Senator Williams' place in sponsoring the bill, this order should be discharged. However, it may be that Senator Adams, who seconded Senator Williams's motion, will wish to sponsor the bill.