

There are even some theaters, and it is legally questionable or somebody could sue them, who do not book movies like this because in Pennsylvania there is a bishop who does not only see that the movies are banned but if a theater plays one of the condemned movies, then the theater is out of bounds for Catholics for, I think 5 years. I think this would be a restraint if anybody wanted to sue the Catholic Church, it would be some kind of restraint of trade.

But I am a knight of the Holy Order of Saint Sepulchre and therefore I could not sue the Catholic Church. I really am. It is the highest order that the Catholic Church can give to a non-Catholic.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Let us move from religious condemnation of a production to the failure of the Moving Picture Association of America to approve it. If they were to not approve a particular production, would that not sort of create a lot of interest in it on the part of the public?

Mr. PREMINGER. No; not always, because there, too, you know, many people wouldn't see it. Many people don't take ads if it does not have the seal from the Moving Pictures Association.

It is true there are movies on 42d Street and movies made, really salacious movies. Nobody gets rich with these movies. The theaters are not crowded. Or magazines, when next to Life and Time and Newsweek you see on the stands girlie magazines, dirty magazines, nobody makes fortunes with these things. The people are not that dumb.

I think the people know what they want and what entertainment is. That is why I believe that pay television will work because they will have good things to show and new things and it would be a show window for new talent. It would give people an opportunity. In every way it would be great.

Mr. KORNEGAY. As I gather from what you say, No. 1, or the most important message you have for us today in advocating subscription television is that it would afford more competition for the networks, that there is insufficient competition at the present time.

Mr. PREMINGER. Yes, and more competition for talent. It would afford people to direct shows to special segments of the population because it would not be necessary to get that many people to see a certain show.

For instance, "The Ed Sullivan Show." I don't know if it is a very high rated show. It is probably seen by 30 million people every Sunday and it is a very good show. I also look at it sometimes. Personally, at the same time on pay television if for 25 or 50 cents I could see an opera, I would prefer it. But it would not hurt "The Ed Sullivan Show." I still think 30 million people would like to see it, or maybe now only 19 million, but 3 or 4 or 5 million people in this vast land would like to see something better or something more serious.

This kind of competition gives you the chance to really produce and get the money for your production back and not be supported by advertising money.

You see, this also somehow is a very undignified thing, that advertising money that dogfood pays for shows and lets you know it every 15 minutes. I really think, for instance, that in countries that want propaganda against us, if they took a film and would show it