

(b) Toronto 3,766; (c) Edmonton 1,188; (d) Vancouver 1,537; (e) Canada \*24,777.

\*The national figures are available only on a monthly basis. The figures for the week requested have therefore been estimated.

2. In the case of those who were receiving benefits and whose benefit had not exhausted, the reasons for this are as follows: (a) Refusal of an offer of employment; (b) failure to remain available for employment; (c) failure to attend a CMC course of instruction; (d) failure to attend an employment interview.

CMHC—EMPLOYMENT OF MARRIED COUPLES

Question No. 769—Mrs. MacInnis (Vancouver Kingsway):

1. Does the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation now employ any husband or any wife of another person in the employ of the Corporation and, if so, how many?
2. Does CMHC have a written policy in regard to the employment of persons thus related by marriage and, if so, what is the reason for such a policy?
3. How many wives have been refused employment because of such a policy since June 1968?
4. How many husbands have been refused employment because of such a policy since June 1968?
5. Is this policy now under review?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): 1. Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation currently employs five married couples. Three of these couples were employees of CMHC before their marriage, and one couple was hired as a janitor team in a rental project. In the case of the fifth couple, the wife was hired on a short term contract, in a position previously occupied by her, while the present incumbent of the position is on maternity leave.

2. CMHC does not have a written policy governing the employment of married couples. It has been the long standing practice of the Corporation to discourage the hiring of all relatives of employees, and this applies to the hiring of a spouse of an employee. In administering this policy, cases do arise where personnel on staff marry one another. In these few cases that have arisen the Corporation has generally adopted a policy of continuing to employ both persons on the understanding that they will not be working within the same department in an office.

3 and 4. CMHC does not have a record of the number of husbands/wives who have been refused employment since June, 1968.

5. The personnel policies of CMHC are always under review.

Order Paper Questions

LIP PROJECTS

Question No. 777—Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse):

Will additional funds be added to LIP for 1972-73 in order that most projects submitted can be approved and effected and, if so, on what date will it be announced?

[Translation]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): It is agreed that a large number of prospective LIP projects had to be rejected due to the fact that the funds allocated were not sufficient to permit the approval of all applications. I am presently studying the future of the Local Initiatives Program and when a decision is made, the House will be informed.

[English]

TAX LOSS BY GOVERNMENT DUE TO COMMERCIAL BANKRUPTCIES

Question No. 899—Mr. Latulippe:

What amounts in taxes were lost by the government due to commercial bankruptcies in Canada in (a) 1968-69 (b) 1969-70 (c) 1970-71?

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister of National Revenue): In so far as National Revenue, Customs and Excise, is concerned: (a) \$778,481.32; (b) \$517,578.44; (c) \$1,149,321.37.

In so far as the Department of National Revenue, Taxation, is concerned; (a) \$2,195,601; (b) \$3,258,260; (c) \$1,997,861.

LIP PROJECTS

Question No. 1,016—Mr. Fortin:

1. How many LIP projects for 1972-73 (a) were approved in each province (b) were submitted (c) were rejected (d) are still outstanding?
2. For each province, how much was granted and how many participants are there?

[Translation]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. See Schedule 1.

2. The value of approved projects is shown at Column 2A of Schedule 1. At the present time, the information on participants is not available as the contractual details are still being processed.

Schedule 1

Province	1(a) Number of Approved Projects	1(b) Number of Applications Received	1(c) Number of Projects Rejected	1(d) Number of Outstanding Projects	2(a) Value of Approved Projects
Newfoundland.....	327	1,309	982	—	\$11,715,004
Nova Scotia.....	355	1,097	742	—	10,147,304
Prince Edward Island.....	95	251	156	—	1,953,406
New Brunswick.....	407	960	553	—	10,773,249
Quebec.....	1,719	5,635	3,916	—	64,041,478