

American programs at the present moment and blacking out the advertising, which you could do with a gadget sitting on your lap, and then substituting and selling that advertising period?

Mr. Ted Jarmain: That question has been examined by a legal counsel—not our legal counsel—and I understand there are tremendous legal difficulties involved. Frankly I have a great deal of difficulty with it on moral grounds.

The Chairman: In your brief you state:

“I believe that it is neither sensible nor proper to attempt to devise arbitrary rules regarding media ownership.”

Do you mean just what you say there, Mr. Jarmain?

Mr. Ted Jarmain: Yes, I said in the brief, and I will say again, that I think there are examples of organizations that “break the rules” in terms of some theoretical concept of desirable policies of ownership and yet which companies are doing virtually in everyone’s view just a tremendous job.

I think it is downright discriminatory to say “okay all companies that fit this pattern are offside irrespective of the kind of job they are doing.”

I think that we can well afford in Canada to take the trouble to examine each of these situations on its merits.

The Chairman: To examine each situation on its merit there would still need to be some guidelines, would there not?

Mr. Ted Jarmain: I went on to suggest in the brief that I thought perhaps the most logical mechanism for this was we ought to strengthen the general statutes in Canada regarding undesirable concentrations of ownership. I cannot think why the media could not come within that.

Mr. Fortier: The guideline of the Combine Investigation Act is public interest.

Mr. Ted Jarmain: There is not too much wrong with that that I can think of. It just seems to me we spend so much time in Canada digging into the fine detail of all sorts of situations and yet seemingly on the ownership there is a propensity to say “We won’t look at the individual cases but devise a general rule.” I think that is unjust. There are

lots of examples of people, organizations, that do not fit the theoretical optimum patterns of ownership that in my view are doing a tremendous job and we would simply lose by all odds; we would get inferior service if we changed the situation.

The Chairman: Do you have any thoughts in connection with the guidelines as to how much is too much? Obviously if one person owned all the newspapers in Canada you would think that is an undesirable situation, or would you?

Mr. Ted Jarmain: I would say I would have to examine that on the merits. That would not be too hard to do.

Mr. Fortier: Well, if you look at London on the merits do you think there is too much concentration in London?

Mr. Ted Jarmain: I don’t believe so. I think my comments may be particularly appropriate to London. In my view the Free Press organization is just doing a first rate job and my judgment would be that if that organization did not exist there, if it were replaced by two or three other organizations drawn at random, so to speak, from the group of probable contenders, as a citizen of London I am pretty sure that I would lose.

I know it because I think they do a first rate job. I think we would very well end up with a mediocre situation rather than one which is recognized by many people as being first class.

The Chairman: You say “logical contenders”. Presumably you mean the big newspaper chains, do you?

Mr. Ted Jarmain: I didn’t have particular people in mind.

Mr. Ed Jarmain: I think, Mr. Chairman, the logical contender might very well be—certainly it’s going to have to be a large organization because if you are talking about the *London Free Press* that is a large newspaper and it is not going to be bought by a small man. I think you do have to take that for granted.

I would like to add to what Ted has already said about the Free Press organization. I have lived in London more years than Ted has and I feel the same way he does. So first of all I am going to endorse what he has just said.