

This first amendment should read: "responsibility of speech." I have the right and the responsibility to speak in support of goodness and truth, to speak for those who have no voices.

By these standards, who would oppose this democracy? Who would oppose a family of people with voices, who exercise their natural rights and speak directly to their government for the good of all? My voice in our democracy speaks loudly, and with the same weight as all other voices carry, whether they belong to bodies older, younger, or of a different color than my own. It baffles me why so many people have no pressing desire to become a citizen of this fine democracy. The chance to have a voice in one's own country, to influence the world with what one has to say, is a powerful opportunity. Presented to many countries of the world, this tantalizing chance would be fought for like it was at our country's birth, when the first Americans would not let their voices go unheard. How fortunate to live in a country where lives are not lost searching for their voices!

I am lucky to live in such a democracy. I am fortunate to be able to speak without fear of persecution, to voice my message to the world. So many voiceless people do not have this chance. And as I speak on the importance of my voice and the voice of others, I have already made the first step . . . and I am being heard.

SUNSHINE IN THE COURTROOM

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1998

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1252) to modify the procedures of the Federal courts in certain matters, and for other purposes:

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to H.R. 1252, the Judicial Reform Act, but would like to say a few words about one provision of the bill that merits strong bipartisan support.

I refer to Section 8 of the bill, which would allow Federal appellate judges, in their sole discretion, to permit televised transmission of court proceedings. It would also allow Federal district court judges to permit televised proceedings on a three-year experimental basis.

Americans have always taken a strong interest in the workings of the justice system. Yet those who have had little direct exposure to the process derive their impressions largely from fictional courtroom dramas and sensational coverage of high-profile trials. It is little wonder that many lack a proper understanding of the process by which justice is meted out in our society, and hold in scant regard the judicial officers upon whom the integrity of that process depends.

Cameras in the courtroom offer the public an alternative: an unfiltered, unedited, unvarnished glimpse of the judicial process as it really is. Like C-SPAN, which enables viewers to interpret legislative proceedings for themselves, free of intrusive commentary, televised trials allow viewers to make their own judgments regarding the fairness of the judge, the competence of counsel, the credibility of witnesses, and the quality of the evidence pre-

sented. Through first-hand observation, the average citizen can develop a greater respect for the requirements of due process, and a fuller appreciation of the importance of an independent judiciary in preserving the rule of law.

The 48 states that permit broadcast coverage of court proceedings have also found that the presence of cameras has a salutary effect on the proceedings themselves, exposing the trial process to public scrutiny and encouraging fair play, professionalism and decorum. Even judges who were hesitant to authorize television coverage have generally found the experience to be a positive one. Concerns that the media would detract from the solemnity of the proceedings and would violate the sensibilities of the participants have generally proven to be unfounded.

As a district attorney, I strongly supported the introduction of cameras into Massachusetts courtrooms, and chose to participate in the pilot program which Massachusetts undertook in the 1980s. In fact, I prosecuted the first case to go to trial under the program in 1980. The Massachusetts experiment was an enormous success, and led to the adoption of a court rule instructing judges to permit electronic coverage of public proceedings, subject to various limitations designed to ensure fairness to the parties and to safeguard the integrity of the proceedings.

From 1991-93, the Judicial Conference of the United States conducted a pilot program in six U.S. district courts and two U.S. courts of appeals which yielded similar results. A 1994 evaluation by the Federal Judicial Center concluded that cameras should be permitted in all Federal civil proceedings.

Naturally, there are some cases in which trial participants have an overriding need for anonymity, and in such cases the judge must have the discretion to bar cameras from the courtroom. Some 15 years after that first televised trial, I was the prosecutor in a highly publicized trial involving the murder of two women at a family planning clinic. In order to protect the victims' families and witnesses who were clinic patients and employees, I filed a motion asking the court to exercise its discretion to exclude cameras from the trial. The judge granted our motion based on the special circumstances of the case.

The bill provides for such situations by giving Federal judges unfettered discretion to exclude cameras at any time and for any reason.

Mr. Chairman, an educated and informed citizenry is essential to a healthy, functioning democracy. This measure will enhance public understanding of a central pillar of our democracy, and deserves our support. While I regret that it was attached to a highly controversial bill whose other provisions I could not support, I very much hope that it can be included elsewhere on our legislative agenda.

HONORING ANTHONY HARRIS ON THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF STONE'S RESTAURANT

HON. RON KLINK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1998

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very dear friend, Anthony Harris and

a Washington, D.C. restaurant institution. On Friday, May 1, 1998 Anthony "Boss of the Sauce" Harris will celebrate the 30th Anniversary of Stoney's Restaurant.

Located at 1307 L Street in Northwest Washington, DC, Stoney's has faithfully served its clientele, 365 days a year. Over the last 30 years there have been many changes in Washington, but one thing that has remained the same is Stoney's. Whether you are there for the half priced burgers, chopped salads, or simply the conversation, Tony and his staff do not disappoint. The food at Stoney's is tremendous, the service friendly and the atmosphere is genuine. Stoney's has a familiar Pittsburgh aura, the kind of place where you always feel at home.

I applaud Anthony Harris for his hard work and dedication. His success and commitment are one that few in this fine city can claim. It is with great pride that I rise before you and ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Stoney's on their 30th Anniversary. I wish Anthony Harris, Mo, Sandy and all of the employees at Stoney's the best of luck for thirty more years of success.

TRIBUTE TO THE LINCOLN FIRE COMPANY

HON. BILL PASCHELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 30, 1998

Mr. PASCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the momentous occasion of the 90th Anniversary of the Borough of Totowa's Lincoln Fire Company.

The Lincoln Fire Company was formed in 1908 by a group of civic minded citizens who met at the Willard Park Hotel. The corporation papers were filed and recorded on April 23, 1908. In that same month the governing body of the Borough passed an ordinance that established the Borough of Totowa Fire Department and included the Lincoln Fire Company as one of two companies in the Borough. In July of that same year a committee was appointed for the election of a chief and assistant chief. The first elected Chief was George McCrea and the first Assistant Chief Thomas Dunkerly.

In the early years of the Company the engine was attached to passing wagons to get it to a fire. The engine carried fire pails, ladders, lanterns, hose and the firefighters' gear. Alarms were sounded by striking large steel gongs with hammers made available to citizens located in strategic areas. Whenever available, citizens who owned horses would bring them to the fire house, hitch them to the apparatus and bring it to the fire scene. For this favor a citizen was paid the sum of \$2.00.

Lincoln's headquarters have been located in what is now known as the "Old Borough Hall" since it acquired space on the ground floor of the building on Lincoln Avenue somewhere around 1910. The front part of the building housed the apparatus and the rear section of the building provided space for the Company members to hold their meetings. Additional space was acquired when the Police Department moved to the new municipal building in 1969. The meeting room has been completely remodeled and now serves as a place to hold social functions as well as meetings.