

We agree with that principle because this is a democratic process. We agree with that.

But what we cannot agree with was such a basic policy, because it is basic, you know, not to recognize the CRTC; and we could not share that point of view.

**The Chairman:** Senator McElman, have you any other questions?

**Senator McElman:** Not on that point.

[Translation]

**Mr. Fortier:** You spoke of certain American programmes that are dubbed in French. What percentage of Télé-Métropole's programmes are American and dubbed in French?

**Mr. Giguère:** As you can see from the figures I gave you, this is still a recent development; it started about two years ago. The percentage is not very high at present. But I can tell you that for the next fall season, I believe 50 per cent of the American programs we broadcast will have been dubbed in Montreal.

**Mr. Fortier:** In your own studios?

**Mr. Giguère:** No, it is done by companies that specialize in it.

**Mr. Fortier:** Before that, they were dubbed in Paris?

**Mr. Giguère:** Yes.

**Mr. Fortier:** Did Télé-Métropole initiate this trend?

**Mr. Giguère:** No, the CBC was first, I have to admit that. Then we followed suit, and why not? The amounts involved are considerable, you know. To give you an example, a series of 40 programmes can come to, I don't know, somewhere between \$60,000. and \$75,000 in fees per series. It provides work for performers, in the meantime.

**Mr. Fortier:** You recommend that for such programs, the CRTC should recognize a percentage of Canadian content, and that there should be a points system. Is that what you recommended to the CRTC?

**Mr. Giguère:** That was more or less it, yes. The idea is that a 5 per cent Canadian content should be allowed for that as part of the CRTC's total content requirement; I suggested 5 per cent. This gives us a much stronger argument when we are dealing with an American producer, because we tell him quite simply: "Look, we have to think about

Canadian content; and if we dub it in Montreal, we get 6 per cent; if we dub it in Paris, we don't".

**Mr. Fortier:** You say you favour a press council for Quebec. In your view, would such a council have a different function from that which the CRTC is supposed to perform and tries to perform?

**Mr. Giguère:** I think so.

**Mr. Fortier:** Could you give us some idea of how it would differ?

**Mr. Giguère:** First, I should like to make it clear that the press council would be concerned only with information and news, not with programming. I think that a press council with sufficient prestige would be very useful, because in the course of a year, there is quite a variety of problems that confront broadcasters and newspapermen, perhaps the latter more than the former. I should tell you that the man who put this proposal to us was a print journalist. He came to see us and explained his proposal, and we listened carefully and said yes. It is a prestige organization, for all practical purposes, in which the public, journalists and owners of broadcasting companies or newspapers would all have a say. It is a body without specific powers, but if it pronounced an opinion on some serious matter, it would—shall we say—carry weight.

**Mr. Fortier:** What is known in Europe as a "court of honour"

**Mr. Giguère:** Yes.

**Mr. Fortier:** You are doubtless familiar with the press council that operates in England; as you know, it has only a moral power, and only over print, not the electronic media. My question really was: why do you feel it is necessary in Canada, in general, and in Quebec, in particular, for the electronic press itself to be subject to a press council?

**Mr. Giguère:** Note that when you say "subject", that may be a bit strong.

**Mr. Fortier:** Voluntarily subject.

**Mr. Giguère:** Remember, we have never had any major problems. It was 10 years last February, and we have never had a major problem. But I believe the machinery is valid, and that is quite an arbitrary opinion on my part. My statement is not based on any problem I could specify, but ..