331 Cooper Street, Ottawa. Jackson Building (Crown-owned) (a), (b), (c) and (d) Not applicable. (a) Floor space leased, Nicol Building, 9,700 sq. ft. (b) From whom, Nicol Building, rented from W. M. Nicol of Nicol, O'Conner & Kealey, Barristers. (c) For what period of time Nicol Building, Fall of 1971. (d) At what annual cost, Nicol Building, $4.10 per sq. ft.; that is, 9,700 sq. ft. at $4.10 per sq. ft. for a total of $39,770.

3. CIDA does not provide a limousine and a chauffeur for the President. (a), (b), (c), (d) not applicable. The President does, however, utilize, for business purposes as required, a personally owned vehicle of an employee and the services of the employee as driver, with the employee being reimbursed for mileage in accordance with mileage rate rules.

4. The Department of Public Works did not actually renovate the offices of the President of CIDA and of certain of his immediate staff, but rather effected alterations to offices, the initial construction of which was nearing completion at the time the President took office. (a) Work carried out by contract. (b) Total cost of renovations was $3,135.

FINANCIAL AID FOR PRODUCTION OF "PILE OU FACE"

Question No. 984—**Mr. Valade:**

1. Has Canada Council or any government agency given grants or financial aid for the production of *Pile ou Face*, a film now being shown in some Montreal theatres and, if so, how much money was contributed?

2. Has this film any artistic value?

3. What criteria justified such assistance?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): 1. Yes, the Canadian Film Development Corporation. I am informed by the Canadian Film Development Corporation that the amount of each individual loan and investment in Canadian feature film production is not made public in order to protect the financial position of the applicant in his negotiations with possible purchasers of the completed film.

2. and 3. In the opinion of the Canadian Film Development Corporation, the feature film, *Pile ou Face*, conforms to the requirements of section 10(2)(a) of the Canadian Film Development Corporation Act of "significant Canadian creative, artistic and technical content", in addition to meeting requirements concerning financing and distribution.

CANADIAN UNITARIAN AID TO VIETNAM

Question No. 1,027—**Mr. Brewin:**

1. Has the government received a request from the Canadian Unitarian Aid to Vietnam to grant an export permit to ship medical equipment for aid to civilians in North Vietnam?

2. Was a permit for the shipment of such goods issued on May 13, 1969 for goods identified as being of Canadian and German origin and, if so, what was the value of the goods permitted to be shipped under such permit?

3. Was a permit refused to the said organization for the export to North Vietnam of medical equipment of American manufacture and, if so (a) was it refused at the request of any American authorities (b) what American officials made the request (c) was the request in writing (d) what was the ground for such a request?

4. Has the government made representations to the appropriate American authorities that the refusal to permit the shipment of medical supplies for civilians is in contravention of Article 23 of the provisions of the Geneva Convention which provides that—"Each high contracting party shall allow the free passage of all consignments of medical and hospital stores intended only for civilians of another high contracting party even if the latter is its adversary"?

5. Has the government made representations to the appropriate American authorities that the refusal to ship these American goods is contrary to the spirit if not the letter of the Geneva Convention and to humanitarian principles and, if so, what has been the reply of the American authorities?

6. Has the government granted or refused any permits to export medical supplies to South Vietnam?

Mr. Bruce Howard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. Yes.

2. Yes. It is the government's policy not to disclose details of an individual export permit application.

3. Yes. (*a*) No. (*b*) (*c*) (*d*) Not applicable.

4. No.

5. No.

6. Granted, yes; refused, no.

INCOME DERIVED FROM COMPUTER SERVICES

Question No. 1,114—**Mr. Robinson:**

What income, if any, is derived from the computer services provided by the Department of Communications (a) from other departments (b) from sale or services to industry (c) to provincial government departments (d) to municipalities?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications): (*a*) to (*d*) None.

*MANPOWER—STUDY OF EMPLOYMENT OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Question No. 1,122—**Mr. Nystrom:**

1. Was a survey study of employment of university students released by the Department of Manpower and Immigration on February 4, 1971 and, if so, was any consideration given to the inclusion in the study of students who did not return to university because they were unable to find summer employment?

2. Was there any indication that any of the students, who were unsuccessful in seeking employment, stated they had not sought employment?

3. What was the population of students in accredited universities in the academic year 1969-1970?

4. Was the survey based on oral or written questions?

5. What was the response rate?

6. Would the government be prepared to Table the questionnaire and an outline of the method used?

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, in view of the extent of the reply, may I ask leave of the House to have the reply considered as recorded in *Hansard* at this point?

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.