

11/2006—Sent letter requesting early audio release of Parents Involved v. Seattle School District No. 1 and Meredith v. Jefferson County Board of Education (affirmative action). Court agreed.

11/2006—Requested early audio release of oral arguments in Parents Involved v. Seattle School District No. 1 and Meredith v. Jefferson County Board of Education (Affirmative action) Court agreed. Press Release

1/2007—Sent letter requesting early audio release of Davenport v. Washington Education Association and Washington v. Washington Education Association (Union dues). Denied.

1/2007—Introduction of the Sunshine in the Courtroom Act of 2007 in the 110th Congress, co-sponsored by Sens. Grassley (R-IA), Leahy (D-VT) and Schumer (D-NY).

1/2007—Sen. Arlen Specter (R-PA) introduces cameras in the Supreme Court legislation. Watch

2/2007—Sent letter requesting early audio release of Rita v. United States and Claiborne v. United States (Federal sentencing guidelines). Denied

2/2007—Rep. Ted Poe (D-TX/2nd), a former judge, delivers a floor speech about opening the court to cameras. Watch

2/2007—Sens. Specter and Cornyn discuss cameras in the courts with Justice Anthony Kennedy during Judiciary Committee hearing. Sen. Specter questions Justice Kennedy directly. Watch/Sen. Cornyn remarks on his experience with cameras. Watch/Watch Hearing

3/2007—Justices Kennedy and Thomas comment on cameras in the court before a House Appropriations Subcommittee hearing on the FY08 Supreme Court budget. Watch Justice Kennedy/Watch Justice Thomas

3/2007—Sent letter requesting early audio release of FEC v. Wisconsin Right to Life and McCain v. Wisconsin Right to Life (Campaign Finance). Denied.

3/7/2007—Sent letter requesting camera coverage of 3rd circuit CBS vs. FCC hearing on Television Indecency Standards. Received permission for audio only.

8/16/2007—Aired camera footage of Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals 8/15/07 oral argument in two cases on the government's warrantless wiretapping program. Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation, Inc. v. Bush Hepting v. AT&T

9/11/2007—Aired same-day audio of CBS vs. FCC hearing on Television Indecency Standards.

9/27/2007—C-SPAN President Susan Swain testifies before House Judiciary Committee on H.R. 2128, Sunshine in the Courtroom Act of 2007. Watch/Read Testimony

9/2007—Sent letter requesting early audio release of Medellin v. Texas (Presidential Powers) and Stoneridge Investment v. Scientific-Atlanta (Securities Fraud). Denied.

10/2007—Sent letter requesting early audio release of Boumediene v. Bush & Al Odah v. U.S. (Guantanamo Detainees) Court Agreed. Press Release

11/16/2007—9th Circuit Court of Appeals opinion in Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation v. Bush cites C-SPAN'S request to record oral argument and date footage was televised. See footnote 5, page 14969.

12/06/2007—Senate Judiciary Committee votes in favor of sending S. 344 to the full Senate for a vote. The bill would require television coverage of the Supreme Court's open sessions unless a majority of justices vote to block cameras for a particular case.

1/2008—Request for same-day audio release of oral argument in Baze v. Rees (Lethal Injection). Court agreed. Press Release

1/02/2008—Request for same-day audio release of oral argument in Crawford v. Marion County (Voting Rights). Denied.

1/16/2008—NY Times Editorial on Cameras in the Supreme Court.

3/2008—Request denied for same-day audio release of oral argument in United States v. Ressaam ("Millennium Bomber" case).

3/2008—Request granted for same-day audio release of oral argument in District of Columbia v. Heller (DC Gun Law). Press Release

3/6/2008—The Senate Judiciary Committee passes the "Sunshine in the Courtroom Act" which allows cameras in federal court rooms with a vote of 10-8 with one member abstaining. The bill is referred to the full senate for consideration. Press Release

3/21/2008—Rochester Democrat and Chronicle Editorial on allowing cameras in the Supreme Court.

4/14/08—Request for same-day audio release of oral argument in Kennedy v. Louisiana (Death Penalty for Rape) denied.

9/26/2008—Request for same-day audio release of oral argument in Altria Group, Inc. v. Good (Marketing of "Light" Cigarettes) and Winter v. Natural Resources denied. Request Letter

10/15/2008—Request for same-day audio release of oral argument in FCC v. Fox Television Stations (Television Indecency Standards) denied. Request Letter Story

11/12/2008—Request for audio release of oral argument in Pleasant Grove City v. Summum (Free Speech) denied.

12/3/2008—Request for audio release of oral argument in Phillip Morris USA Inc. v. Williams (Supreme Court-State Court authority) denied.

12/10/2008—Request for same-day audio release of oral argument in Ashcroft v. Iqbal (Can President's Cabinet be sued for constitutional violations by subordinates) denied.

3/3/2009—Request for audio release of oral argument in Caperton v. A.T. Massey (Should elected state judges recuse themselves) denied.

3/27/2009—Joint request for same-day audio release of oral argument in Northwest Austin Municipal Utility District Number One v. Holder 4-291 granted. Request Letter Article

7/2009—Judge Sotomayor questioned about cameras in the court during her confirmation hearings. Sen. Specter on Opinion Poll Sen. Specter on Cameras in the Court Sen. Kohl on Cameras in the Court

7/2009—British Supreme Court decides to televise events from inside the court's three chambers. Article

8/7/2009—Boston Herald op-ed by Wayne Woodlief: "Televised justice would be for all." Article

9/9/2009—Request for Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission (Campaign Finance). Agreed.

11/2009—Requests for audio releases of oral arguments in Jones v. Harris Associates (Investment fund fees), Graham v. Florida (life sentence for minor), and Sullivan v. Florida (life sentence for minor). Denied.

2/16/10—Request for request for same-day audio release of oral argument in Holder v. Humanitarian Law Project. Denied.

2/26/10—C-SPAN requests for same-day audio release of oral arguments in Skilling v. United States and McDonald v. City of Chicago on Tuesday, March 2nd—denied.

4/7/10—C-SPAN requests same-day audio release of oral argument in Christian Legal Society Chapter v. Martinez on April 19. Denied.

4/15/10—During hearing of House Appropriations-Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Services, Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer comments on cameras in the court. Click here to watch

4/29/10—C-SPAN statement on today's Senate Judiciary Committee passage of two bills concerning TV cameras in the Supreme Court. Press Release

5/10/10—Pres. Obama nominates U.S. Solicitor General Elena Kagan. She gave remarks on cameras in the court during a Ninth Circuit Judicial Conference from July, 23, 2009. Click here to watch

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands in recess, under the previous order, until 2:30 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:01 p.m., recessed until 2:30 p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator NELSON of Florida be recognized for up to 11 minutes as in morning business and Senator DEMINT be recognized for up to 10 minutes; that during this time that has been requested, there be no amendments or motions in order, and that upon use or yielding back of the time, I be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

THE GULF COAST DISASTER

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, in my at least weekly report to the Senate about what is happening down on the Gulf Coast, I am sad to report to you that as of this moment, one of the remote operating vehicles has bumped into that top hat process that was funneling the oil off of the big structure, the blowout preventer from the pipe, the riser pipe, with the result that all of that oil now is not being siphoned off. The estimates now are upwards and probably pretty close to 60,000 barrels a day of oil gushing into the Gulf of Mexico.

Remember, when it started off, oh, it was only 1,000 barrels a day. Then it was only 5,000 barrels a day. Then it was maybe 12,000 barrels a day but max 20,000 barrels a day. Senator BOXER and I were able to get the streaming video out so the scientists could look and they could make their estimates, their calculations. Anyway, it has gone on and on. It is now up to 60,000 barrels of oil a day.

The oil industry had said they had started siphoning off—first it was 10,000, then it was 15,000. They were trying to get it up to 25,000. Now, since this accident, that is being shut down—let's hope just very temporarily, but we are now back to the point that most of the oil is gushing back into the gulf. We know the result.

If this continues for another 2 months, to the end of the summer, it is going to fill up the gulf with oil and it is going to do just what it is doing now. When the wind comes this way, it brings the oil from the South to the North; it brings it in onshore. The oil

is now all the way from the wellhead off Louisiana, all the way across the gulf coast of northwest Florida. The blessing we had is that the wind has kept most of it off the coast. But, inevitably, when the wind rises up in the South, it brings the tar balls up. It has brought some of that terrible-looking orange mousse. That is one of the most repulsive-looking things. When I saw that in Pensacola Bay, to think of that in a pristine bay such as that and that the tides and wind were carrying it right to downtown Pensacola—that is what we are having to deal with.

Tomorrow, the Energy Committee is having a hearing on legislation Senator MENENDEZ and I have sponsored. This is to rectify the situation that brought us to this situation in the first place; that is, the safety checks were not made, the attention to detail on the application was not paid, and the checks were not made to see that the backup devices on the blowout preventer were, in fact, going to be there. In other words, the oil regulator—the part of the U.S. Government that is supposed to do all of these safety checks—was not functioning.

Why was it not functioning? Because for better than a decade, there has been a cozy relationship between the oil industry and the regulator, called the Minerals Management Service in the Department of the Interior, and that regulator was so compromised by gifts, by trips, by jobs. Indeed, I am sad to report that the 2008 inspector general's report talked about there were parties, there was booze, there were drugs, there were illicit sexual relationships going on between the industry and the government regulators. How can you have government regulation under these conditions?

Of course, there was the revolving door. The revolving door happens in other regulated industries as well, but this one was particularly revolving and revolving. What that is, somebody would come out of the oil industry, they would go through the revolving door, they would go right into the government regulator shop, they would stay there for a while and they would supposedly be an independent regulator, but, no, the door would revolve again and they would then go right back out of the government job, back into the oil industry—the very industry they were supposed to be regulating before. Is that a conflict of interest? You bet it is. Can you have an independent regulator? Of course you can't under those circumstances.

So Senator MENENDEZ and I have filed a bill. As a matter of fact, we had this back in 2008 when that inspector general's report came out. We could not get anybody to pay any attention to it back then. What is the result of lax regulation? It is exactly what has been visited upon us—this trauma so many people in that region of the Gulf of Mexico are suffering.

As the administration goes about the process of cleaning up the Minerals

Management Service, reorganizing it, getting new personnel, then it is up to us to change the law to make sure there are penalties—indeed, even criminal penalties—for gifts and trips by the very industry you are supposedly regulating, which in this case claimed 11 lives and countless jobs and livelihoods and a whole way of life in a culture along the gulf coast.

The bill that will be heard tomorrow, which we are grateful for, sets new penalties. It sets a limit—a mere 2 years—so that when someone comes out of the government regulator's office, they can't be employed in that oil industry they have just regulated until a period of time of 2 years has lapsed. It also provides penalties for the gifts, the trips, the favors we have seen chronicled, not in my words but in the words of the 2008 inspector general's report; the report 2 months ago, the inspector general's report; and the report a month ago, the inspector general's report. In this last report, he particularly talked about the revolving door. It is something we have to change. Sadly, it has taken the biggest environmental disaster in U.S. history, but because of this tragic condition, this Congress ought to be poised now to crack down on the government's buddy-buddy relationships with the oil industry.

Tomorrow, the Senate Energy Committee is set to begin debating legislation aimed at cutting the oil drillers' close ties to the industry and aimed at stopping that revolving door. It is going to prohibit the employees of the Minerals Management Service or its successor—since the Secretary of Interior, Ken Salazar, is now busting it up—they are going to have to wait around for 2 years before they get a job back in the industry. The goal is obvious: to limit the degree of influence big oil has on those who are hired to keep the drillers in line. It is the least we can do for those folks down home who are suffering so much right now. They expect us to update laws to meet the times. This is such a time.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

THE CAPITAL GAINS AND DIVIDEND TAX

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few minutes on the motion that relates to the coming increases in capital gains tax and dividend tax. Very few Americans are aware and I think even some people in the Senate are not aware that in about 6 months, there is going to be a tax explosion in this country—taxes on everyone from the 10-percent bracket all the way up to major corporations. Taxes are going up at a time when we know raising taxes will kill jobs in America.

The Heritage Foundation estimates that if we allow taxes to expire this year, the current rate of taxes to ex-

pire, and taxes go up in our economy, in the first year we could lose 270,000 jobs. This is really unacceptable when unemployment is already nearly 10 percent, the economy is waning, and we just got a bad housing report. As all of these companies plan for their future, they are certainly not going to risk capital to expand their companies and add people if they know their taxes are going to go up.

What I proposed as part of this debate on a tax bill is to focus on just one area that we know has a lot to do with investment, with growth of companies; that is, the capital gains tax and the dividends tax. My motion would refer the underlying bill back to committee to add the provisions that cap gains tax and dividend taxes will both stay at 15 percent. If we do not act, in 6 months the capital gains taxes will go from 15 to 20 percent and the dividend taxes, which affect a lot of senior citizens on fixed incomes, will go from 15 all the way up to nearly 40 percent. That makes absolutely no sense in a recession and with the joblessness we have across this country. Surely, as a Senate, as a Congress, we could recognize that raising taxes on investment—those who are going to risk their capital—does not make sense when we are trying to do everything we can to stimulate the economy.

We tried it the other way. We tried the government spending approach. We all know this government spending plan we call the stimulus, where we spent nearly \$1 trillion, has failed. The President promised that if we rushed that through and got stimulus immediately into the economy, over a year ago, that we could keep unemployment below 8 percent and put Americans back to work. But since then, we have lost millions of real jobs. We have added some government jobs because this is basically a government spending plan, but we certainly have not put the real economy most Americans depend on back to work.

We are continuing to lose ground. Yet we stick to this failed stimulus plan. Even when we try to pay for extending unemployment benefits with unspent stimulus money, my colleagues on the other side are holding so tightly to this that they will not even use that money to pay for it. Instead, they want to raise taxes and add to our debt—again, at a time when we really cannot afford this as a nation, when all of the so-called economic experts are warning us that this debt we have today is unsustainable. But almost every week in this body, the Democrats are proposing programs that add to the debt, that increase taxes—everything that is counter to improving our economy and adding to jobs and helping to build a brighter future in this country. Even some of those who were strong supporters of the stimulus bill have come out publicly and said: We guessed wrong. I am afraid we should not continue to guess.

One thing we know from history is— if we look back over several decades—