

NEWS FROM:

C-SPAN AMERICA'S NETWORK

Suite 155 • 400 N. Capitol Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001

Release: F.Y.I.
April 17, 1987

Contact: Susan Swain
(202) 737-3220

Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia at the Federal Communications Bar Association luncheon, April 16, 1987. Aired live on C-SPAN.

On the prospect of televising Supreme Court proceedings:

"The only thing I have against it is I think it would be disruptive if there were lights shining down upon the Court when it sits. If you can develop a camera that doesn't require that, and indeed I guess there are some developed already, I don't have any objection to it at all. You might say that Schumpeter's law applies to that as to other things as well. There are risks involved -- the obvious risks are that counsel would use the argument of a case as a publicity mechanism, either for him, for his firm, or for his cause, instead of simply as a means of persuading judges about the correctness of his case. There's also the risk, of course, that the judicial process may be sensationalized, it would not be by televising the proceedings in toto. What will inevitably happen, of course, is that there will be off-takes from whoever does it, C-SPAN or anybody else, and that little snidbits (*sic*) will appear on the network news. I would be disingenuous to say that those are not, in my view, unfortunate consequences. But, all in all, I personally would not object to it."

P.S. - C-SPAN has committed itself to televising all of the Supreme Court's oral arguments (approximately 160 hours), should cameras be allowed inside the Court.

#

CABLE SATELLITE PUBLIC AFFAIRS NETWORK

NEWS FROM:

C-SPAN AMERICA'S NETWORK

Suite 155 • 400 N. Capitol Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001

Release: F.Y.I.
April 17, 1987

Contact: Susan Swain
(202) 737-3220

Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia at the Federal Communications Bar Association luncheon, April 16, 1987. Aired live on C-SPAN.

On the prospect of televising Supreme Court proceedings:

"The only thing I have against it is I think it would be disruptive if there were lights shining down upon the Court when it sits. If you can develop a camera that doesn't require that, and indeed I guess there are some developed already, I don't have any objection to it at all. You might say that Schumpeter's law applies to that as to other things as well. There are risks involved -- the obvious risks are that counsel would use the argument of a case as a publicity mechanism, either for him, for his firm, or for his cause, instead of simply as a means of persuading judges about the correctness of his case. There's also the risk, of course, that the judicial process may be sensationalized, it would not be by televising the proceedings in toto. What will inevitably happen, of course, is that there will be off-takes from whoever does it, C-SPAN or anybody else, and that little snidbits (*sic*) will appear on the network news. I would be disingenuous to say that those are not, in my view, unfortunate consequences. But, all in all, I personally would not object to it."

P.S. - C-SPAN has committed itself to televising all of the Supreme Court's oral arguments (approximately 160 hours), should cameras be allowed inside the Court.

#

CABLE SATELLITE PUBLIC AFFAIRS NETWORK