

for one am not prepared to bank \$75 million on the future of cable.

Mr. Fortier: You do not think it is the system of the future?

Mr. Giguère: I think cable systems are capable of being that, but there may be other systems as well. It should not be forgotten that the cable, if you stop to consider it, is a "pet theory". We started with the telephone, then wireless, then we turned to microwave transmission, then the cable, and satellites are next. So which is it to be? There will be something else, you know. I am told that work is being done on lasers. Some very advanced studies are being conducted in New York. I do not know what the laser is going to do in communications, but it may have an extraordinary influence. I am not an engineer or a technician, but let us just say that I do some reading from time to time in order to know what is going to happen. Nothing is absolute, you know.

But we are discussing the principle, if government authorities, acting through the CRTC, decide that—well, I think if that is the case now, we are talking about 10 or 15 years. I would like to remind you that in Montreal, only 14 per cent of households—and cable has been there for 10 or 15 years or whatever.

Mr. Fortier: But it is increasing at a rate of 35 to 40 per cent annually.

Mr. Giguère: It is rising more quickly. But the fact remains that the majority of households do not have it yet, and I do not think you will find a majority of households with it over the next five years.

[Text]

The Chairman: Just what percentage of the homes in Montreal have cable?

Mr. Giguère: About 14 per cent.

The Chairman: Would this 14 per cent be equally divided between French and English homes?

Mr. Giguère: I would not hazard a guess in this but I would suspect they would be in the majority for English-speaking people in Montreal.

The Chairman: There would be more English using cable than French?

Mr. Giguère: Yes.

The Chairman: The French-Canadians who have cable in Montreal presumably would be bilingual—all of them would be.

Mr. Giguère: They would, yes, their first interest would be in American programs, but if you stop thinking about the utility of cable in the Montreal area, if I may say so, with a very simple antenna you can get these same American stations and you can get a very high-class antenna for \$125.00 with beautiful reception from the frontier stations, and it will cost you ordinarily \$6.00—by the month—so there is an economic factor also, and cable will not give you much better quality than you would get with your antenna.

The Chairman: With a good antenna.

Mr. Giguère: Yes.

[Translation]

Mr. Fortier: Before leaving this field in which you have enlightened us, Mr. Giguère, I believe it is appropriate for me to refer you to the last paragraph in your brief...

Mr. Giguère: I hope it is a good one!

Mr. Fortier: ...and explain to us to what extent the federal Government should help the private television industry in Canada.

Mr. Giguère: You have noted that it is a small paragraph of four and a half lines...

Mr. Fortier: It was thrown in at the last minute?

Mr. Giguère: I do not know what thought prompted it.

Mr. Fortier: You do not expect us to let it pass without comment?

Mr. Giguère: This is the basis of my thinking. I think it would be in the interests of the public at large if the Government were to assist broadcasters in one way or another. I can go no further, because I cannot give you an exact idea. But let us consider a parallel case. The Government now pays \$50 million to the film industry, in one way or another. It becomes a partner with a film producer and a company.

Mr. Fortier: There is an Act respecting it. Gratien Gélinas is President...

Mr. Giguère: Quite. I believe it would be a good thing if we were to study the possibility of making funds available to broadcasters for special projects. I mentioned some things we