

*Income Tax Amendment*

born, and most of us have birth certificates: They bear numbers. Most of us are married: Marriage licences have numbers. Some may have been divorced and divorce certificates have numbers. When finally we die, our death certificates will have numbers.

**An hon. Member:** We have got your number, too.

**Mr. Knowles:** Unemployment insurance had always used a number system of its own. Income tax has a numbering system for us. I suppose every person in this chamber has credit accounts and charge accounts and carries identification with respect to them in his pocket. All have numbers on them. I suspect that all of us have with us our railway passes and, though we may not use the trains as much as we used to, we use these passes for identification purposes time and time again. They have letters as well as a number—L.J.R. as well as a number.

Here in the House of Commons we have seat numbers. We have post office box numbers. We even have room numbers. Most of us have insurance policies and every policy has a number. If we own a car, it has a number. In my own province of Manitoba I have had the same number since 1950. Each of us has a driving licence. The number of that licence has now been made permanent in at least the provinces of Manitoba and Ontario. If any of us are fortunate enough to own property with a title to it, there is a number on the title. Most of us probably have mortgages, and they have numbers. When we vote we find our numbers on the voters lists. When we pay municipal taxes we find we have a number on the tax roll. We have telephone numbers. I even do my filing in my office on the basis of a numerical system. During the supper recess I found that the Minister of Finance is included in my filing system, and he has a number in that file.

**An hon. Member:** What is the number?

**Mr. Sharp:** No. 007.

**Mr. Knowles:** I find that I have the hon. member for Kamloops in my files, not because he is the hon. member for Kamloops but because for a number of years he was the Minister of Justice.

**Mr. Chrétiën:** He is number one in the race, too.

**Mr. Sharp:** Have you the remaining Conservative leaders in order?

**Mr. Knowles:** The press is finding it difficult to assign numbers to their order of priority. But for years and years we have used numbers in all kinds of situations for ease in identification, and I find it hard to understand why all of a sudden it has become such a sin to have a number. I use that word with a double meaning, now. I thought the advertisement in Saturday's papers was a bit ridiculous, though I did laugh at it. The Department of National Revenue spent a few dollars telling the people of Canada that every taxpayer must have a SIN—and it was spelled "S-I-N", all in capital letters.

**An hon. Member:** It is the new morality.

**Mr. Knowles:** I wondered what it was and I admit I read the advertisement. The chap who was caricatured was looking at one of those delightful income tax forms. Of course there was a pretty girl shown on it, and every taxpayer was supposed to have a SIN. Of course, one goes on reading to find out what the SIN is, but before the reader is told what it is he is told he must report it on the tax form. I thought it was something one might get an income tax deduction for; I wondered what I might have been missing over a number of years.

**Mr. Lewis:** Would you object to having to report it?

**Mr. Knowles:** I am reminded of the old man who was asked whether, if he had to live his life over again, he would make the same mistakes. His reply was: "Yes, but I would start sooner."

Of course, SIN, to the Department of National Revenue, means Social Insurance Number. I am a little surprised that the department has not been taken to task already for this incursion into the new morality. I do not know whether other hon. members read the advertisement, but I freely confess that I did. I have asked a number of people what they thought about it. Some thought it was very good, because people would read it, while others thought it was less good because it did not really put into people's heads the idea that they must get this number on their income tax forms. But surely we are straining at something or other, when we see a loss or denial of individual liberty in the greater use of numbers in a very complicated situation. I do not think it is any more a denial of individual liberty than it is to have a number on my driver's licence, which I have to show when an officer stops