

Mr. HARVEY. One of the arguments made against subscription television is that there would be a siphoning of talent from commercial television—I will not call it free; I will call it commercial television—to subscription television.

Do you think there would be such a siphoning?

Mr. PREMINGER. There was a siphoning from the legitimate theater to movies and people also predicted the legitimate theater would die when the talkie movies came in. Then there was a siphoning from the movies to television. We all can exist. There is enough talent and it will bring forward new talent. I don't think that we should worry about it. I think this is also free enterprise, that you compete for talent. It is not siphoning; it is competing.

Mr. HARVEY. Don't you think that the talent would appear on the network or on the medium, let us say, of subscription television, whichever one would give it the most money?

Mr. PREMINGER. Probably. For instance, today Mr. Bob Hope is making films and he appears on commercial television, or Mr. Sinatra played the lead in my film; he is making a film now in New York and at the same time a special is appearing on one of the networks and at the same time he is doing a concert tour. He might also then appear on pay television. There should be no monopoly.

Mr. HARVEY. Let us take Bob Hope and Mr. Sinatra. Don't you think that if their prices were doubled on subscription television they would go to subscription television rather than to commercial television?

Mr. PREMINGER. No. Sinatra gets so much today that I don't think it can be doubled. He gets for some commercials—they bought him a house and an office and everything. There is no limit. That is the same thing.

Just like the advertiser told ABC. We want a certain film, "River Kwai." Henry Ford said, "For my new line, I want this film. It doesn't matter what the cost." They paid for one showing, I believe, \$2 million. The same way if the picture is very popular with the public; pay television would pay for it. It never happened before.

Mr. HARVEY. Since I have only 5 minutes, under our committee rule, let me ask one further question so that I don't impose on the others' time.

One of the arguments made against subscription television is that at certain times there would be a preemption of time; in other words, that subscription television would be so popular that it would make, say, in the nighttime hours an effort to advertise on the free networks impossible.

Do you see that in the future?

Mr. PREMINGER. If that happens, that would be the greatest proof that the whole system of the so-called free television, and I call it commercial television like you, sir, was wrong; that television should not be an advertising medium but it should be a free medium where the public pays.

Mr. HARVEY. As I gather the gist of your testimony, you have such strong faith in subscription television that you feel it could very likely disrupt our present broadcasting system.

Mr. PREMINGER. No; I don't believe so. This is an extreme example of the use now. I don't believe so because the present three companies that dominate the present television are so rich and so strong. Also, they will become more inventive. They will compete with pay televi-