continuing their trend toward making us all numbers.

If we might recall the history of this numbering business for a moment, I should like to point out that it first came about when a new system of numbering was developed for unemployment insurance purposes. At that time various instructions went out to teachers and others to register, even though they were not obliged by law to do so. They were instructed to register and obtain what was to be called a social insurance number. Subsequently this was extended so the same numbering system would be used for the purposes of the Canada Pension Plan. Back on April 8, 1964 the Prime Minister stated this was not to be used for income tax purposes. This was an interjection by the Prime Minister as the consequence of a question asked by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition. Now this numbering business is to be extended compulsorily to everyone who files an income tax return. So, Mr. Speaker, I am guessing that every new child soon will be registered as a number. Personally I do not like this trend.

Aside from the intent behind clause 21, as the minister has stated the bill is very, very complicated. I do not propose to discuss it further on second reading, but I hope we shall receive full and complete explanation when we reach the committee stage.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have read the minister's speech of yesterday very carefully. I must congratulate him on his lucidity. At the same time I admit that at the end of it I was not much more enlightened than I was at the beginning, but that is not at all his fault; the complexity of the matter which is before the house is responsible. My dullness and lack of experience in the field make it difficult for me to follow the precise terms of what the minister proposes. So my remarks on behalf of this party on second reading will be very brief indeed.

I cannot do other, Mr. Speaker, than say that all of us in our party are happy that the minister has attempted to close holes which were in the law before. I cannot say anything but words favourable to the idea that the use of the profit sharing plan for the purpose of tax evasion should be stopped. I am particularly pleased that the amendments require the vesting in the employee of any allocation or reallocation of funds.

I am equally glad that the minister makes another demand on the employer which I know from experience to be very important; that is, that the beneficiaries must be informed of their rights. Usually their rights are as complicated as the minister's bill, and it is a difficult for the employees to understand precisely what they are entitled to in many of these profit sharing plans as it is for some of us to understand precisely what these amendments will mean in practice.

Finally I greet with pleasure the fact that the new rules will place some limitation on the kind of investment trustees of such profit sharing plans can make. Obviously those limits are placed there for the purpose of protecting the funds against any possibility of erosion through economic action which might affect the investments.

These are the things which we greet with pleasure. They are necessary. I look forward to the minister's promised explanations on each clause and subclause as they are taken up in the committee of the whole. I hope that any fears I may have in this regard will be dissipated when I understand the details a great deal more than I can honestly say I do now. Because of the general reasons that make the amendments socially desirable we support this bill on second reading. If hon. members hear a shorter speech at this stage I should like to know about it.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. H. A. Olson (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) may very soon hear a shorter speech on second reading. I must agree with him and with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) that this is a complicated bill. Any attempt to launch into a debate at this time in respect of all the facets of the bill would, I believe, be fruitless. Surely it would be better to deal with the various aspects raised when we come to them individually.

There are one or two questions I should like to ask and I hope the minister will deal with them during his remarks in closing the debate on second reading. Last night the minister mentioned different categories of amendments, some of which deal with provincial tax abatements. I am wondering whether these amendments result from agreements between the provinces and the federal government and whether we can look forward to this type of agreement on a continuing if not on a permanent basis. On the other hand, perhaps they are necessary to tidy up certain arrangements pending a full scale federal-provincial conference which I presume will be convened