something about the student loan program. I did not like it when the Federal Government took it over. I admire our U.S. Secretary of Education. I do not think he ought to be the banker of the year. I think we have banks to make loans, but that is not the way it is. The taxpayers now make all the government loans—over $100 billion a year.

Students are making their plans. They are going to be arriving at colleges in August and September. We have a bipartisan proposal that will lower interest rates for every single student taking out a student loan. Yet our friends on the other side want to leave middle-income students out of it, force them to pay twice as much as they should be in interest rates for the next 10 years. That makes no sense. We ought not do that.

Tomorrow what we ought to do is pass the Burr-Manchin proposal that is supported on both sides of the aisle. To the extent it differs with the President's proposal—which is very slight—and with the proposal of the House of Representatives—which is not much—we should then sit down, work something out over the next 3 days, pass it and send it to the President and go on to the next issue. Instead, we have political speeches about how hard it is to go to college. We all know how hard it is to go to college. It is difficult to do. We all want to help. But if we have a solution, we ought to adopt it.

I could play politics too. I know how. Every one of us in this room knows how, otherwise we would not be here. This is not a time for playing politics. This is serious business; 11 million students getting 18 million loans, $100 billion-plus from the American taxpayers. We have a proposal before us that is fair to the taxpayers—it will not cost them any money—it is fair to the students—it does not balance the budget or pay for the health care program or any other thing on the students' backs—and it gives students, many of whom who have no credit rating, no other way to get money, a chance to get several thousand dollars a year at one of the lowest possible rates available in the country. The proposal that is before the Senate that is bipartisan is a permanent solution. It says to the student going to the University of Tennessee or Alaska or Minnesota: If you get a loan this year from the government and you are an undergraduate, the interest rate is 3.66 percent. Your rate on that loan won't change. If you are a middle-income student, the Democrats' plan says it is 6.8 percent, and they say: Wait. Wait for what? Wait for rates to go up?

Why don't we establish this program for students at a time when rates are low? That is to their advantage. Let's have a permanent solution at a time when rates are low. They may go up and, therefore, students may pay more, but they will pay a lot less than they would in the private market. They will have a lot more certainty than if we just come around and play politics with this every year to try to gain some advantage with this student group or that student group.

So we have an opportunity before us. The immigration bill passed before the recess. It showed a good deal of the ability of people on both sides of the aisle to work together. We did that with the farm bill. We did that with the water resources bill. I would submit this is 100 times easier than any of those bills.

When I went home to Tennessee before the Fourth of July recess, I said to somebody who asked me: We are that far apart and we have the President and the Republican House and a bipartisan group of Senators all in about the same place. This ought to be easy to do.

It is still easy to do, but I would implore my Senators to look at the facts—those on the other side of the aisle—and realize I do not think they want to go home and explain why they are leaving over 7 million middle-income students twisting in the wind, paying twice as much on interest rates for the next year as the proposal that they are about to vote against tomorrow. I think that will be pretty hard to explain, and I will bet there will be a lot of explaining to do if that is the end result.

So I pledge—as I have been working with Secretary Duncan, with the White House, with Democrats and Republicans—to try to get a result here. I think we can still do it in the next few days. I would hope we can have a vote on both proposals tomorrow. My guess would be both would fail at this point, but at least that would show we are seriously working toward a solution, and we can sit down and merge these small differences that exist between the bipartisan group here, the Republican House, and the President of the United States.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the immigration bill we passed a couple weeks ago. It was a significant achievement. I have already congratulated all of those in the so-called Gang of 8 who put together the initial draft. It was an example of bipartisanship and recognizing that the other fellow has a point of view—that you respect that—and then you work out your differences. That was an example of the Senate at its finest and what we ought to be doing on every piece of legislation around here.

The final result: 68 votes to 32 votes. Its prospects we know not what because of the different approach in the House and the inability on so many things we have passed here to go to the conference committee to iron out the differences between the House and the Senate.

So I am very appreciative, and I have given my congratulations to all of those who have participated in that immigration bill.

There is a huge flaw. It is a huge flaw in not recognizing that when we want to secure the border, as supposedly was done in order to gain 14 Republican votes to get us to the huge vote of 68 votes for the bill, a major amount of money was added for border security. That is not the flaw. Some may question the amount of money. Indeed, there was $6.5 billion in the initial Gang of 8 compromise for border security. But when it came with the Corker-Hoeven amendment, there was $46.3 billion more, of which over $44 billion was for border security. That is not what is the flaw, although one can argue it.

The flaw is that the amendment that was offered by the Senator from Mississippi and me was not even allowed to be considered, which was to increase not some $50-plus billion for border security—which was the land border—but to add a mere $1 billion for maritime security. That is the flaw. As a matter of fact, if you want border security, it is a fatal flaw. Why? You put up an impenetrable wall—whether it be a fence, an electric fence, an electronic fence, whether it be UAVs, more Border Patrol agents—as a matter of fact, in the Corker-Hoeven amendment, $30 billion of that additional border security was just for Border Patrol agents—all of which is going to make it fairly effective in border security of not allowing people to pass, but it is the land border.

So what is going to happen? You go right around the land border on the maritime border.

It is either going to be on the west coast, on the Pacific, or it is going to be on the east coast, either the Gulf of Mexico and all the Gulf States or the Atlantic, including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Because if someone can be smuggled into one of them and therefore get an identity, then they have free access. Puerto Ricans are American citizens. They have free access to get to the rest of the United States.

So maritime security becomes paramount. But we could not get people here who wanted to spend over $50 billion on border security, which is the land border, which, in fact, is in the bill—they would not allow a Republican Senator, Mr. WICKER, and me to add $1 billion for maritime security.

Specifically, under our amendment, it would have addressed just that part of border security with regard to the Department of Homeland Security. But if we want an effective border security, we have to then get into a whole host of things other than Customs and Border Patrol. We have to get additional

resources for the Coast Guard. We have to consider not only UAVs being flown by the Department of Homeland Security, through Customs, et cetera, over the maritime border, we have to put more Coast Guard out there.

I would suggest a new platform that would be very effective would be what the Navy is testing right now, which is blimps. It is a very cost-effective, long dwell time, that gives enormous coverage at sea by one blimp. I have ridden in those blimps.

The Navy is testing them. I went with the Navy out of Fernandina Beach as they were doing the testing for Mayport Naval Station. It is incredible what you can do on the dwell time of a blimp. Of course, the fuel used is de minimus. The cost of an entire mission for a blimp, some 24 hours of fuel, is the same as cranking up an F–16 taxing out to the runway. That amount of energy, fuel spent is what would be spent on a blimp for an entire 24-hour period as it is doing surveillance.

So if we are going to be sincere about border effectiveness, then, in fact, we are going to have to pay attention to the maritime border as well as the land border. Why are Senator WICKER and I concerned about this? He comes from a Gulf Coast State, Mississippi. I come from the State that has the longest coastline of any State save for the State of Alaska.

My State of Florida has over some 1,500 miles of coast. It is a place that will be a haven for smugglers of people and drugs. If we think we are tightening border security by over $50 billion being applied to the land border, where are the smugglers going to go? They are going to go right around. It is just like water will flow and it will meet the place of least resistance. It will continue to flow. So, too, will the smugglers.

I wish to say I am disappointed that people on that side of the aisle would not allow Senator WICKER's and my amendment to be considered in the last minute. It obviously is not controversial. Yet, for whatever reason, it was denied. I hope as we proceed on the immigration bill—and I hope we are able to proceed if the House will act—I hope in the final product it will be considered and added so we can truly have a secure border, a maritime border as well as a land border.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, soon we will be voting on a district court nominee. I rise in opposition to the nomination of Jennifer Dorsey. That is for the U.S. district judgeship for the District of Nevada. Before I outline the basis for my opposition, I wish to inform my fellow Senators and the American public regarding facts on judicial nominations.

We continue to hear from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about how we are obstructing nominees or treating this President differently. Those complaints are without foundation. I will quantify my answer to prove my point. There is no crisis in the manner in which we are confirming nominees. This is all part of a larger strategy to justify breaking the rules of the Senate to change the rules of the Senate.

The fact is that after today the Senate will have confirmed 199 lower court nominees. We have defeated two. That is 199 to 2. Who can complain about that record? The success rate happens to be 99 percent for the nominees sent by President Obama, considered on the floor of the Senate.

We have been doing it at a very fast pace as well. During the last Congress we confirmed more judges than any Congress since the 103rd Congress. That Congress sat from 1993 through 1994. This year we have already confirmed more judges than were confirmed in the entire first year of President Bush's second term.

So far this year we have confirmed 27 judges. If confirmed today, Ms. Dorsey will be the 28th confirmation this year. Let's compare this with a similar stage, which would be President Bush's second term, when only 10 judicial nominees had been confirmed. So we are now at a 28-to-10 comparison, with President Obama clearly ahead of where President Bush was. But somehow we are hearing complaints.

As I said, we have already confirmed more nominees this year, 28, than we did during the entirety of the year 2005, the first year of President Bush's second term, when 21 lower court judges were confirmed. After today only three article III judges remain on the Senate's Executive Calendar; two district nominees and one circuit nominee.

Yet we hear the same old story. Somehow our friends on the other side of the aisle, the Senate majority, the Senate Democrats, cite this as evidence of obstructionism. Compare that to June 2004, when 30 judicial nominations were on the calendar, 10 circuit, 20 district.

I do not recall any Senate Democrat complaining about how many nominations were piling up on the calendar, nor do I remember protests from my colleagues on the other side that judicial nominees were moving too slowly.

Some of those nominees had been reported out of committee more than 1 year earlier and most were pending for months. Some of them never did get an up-or-down vote. The bottom line is that the Senate is processing the President's nominees exceptionally fairly. I do not know why that message cannot get through. It is an excuse to abuse the rules of the Senate to change the rules of the Senate.

President Obama certainly is being treated more fairly in the beginning of his second term than Senate Democrats treated President Bush in the first year of his last term in office. It is not clear to me how allowing more votes so far this year than President Bush got in an entire year amounts to ''unprecedented delays and obstruction.'' Yet that is the complaint we hear over and over and over again from the other side.

I wanted to set the record straight. It is a sad commentary that I have to spend so much time when figures speak for themselves. But I will set the record straight again before we vote on the nomination of Ms. Dorsey.

I have concerns with this particular nominee. I think all Members are aware of the press accounts of campaign contributions which were made at the time this nomination was under consideration. We have not received a full explanation of what happened. Nevertheless, I am concerned about the appearances of these contributions and how such actions might undermine the public confidence that our citizenry must have in the judicial branch of our government.

I also have concerns about Ms. Dorsey's qualifications to be a Federal judge. She has no criminal law experience. She has participated in only six trials, one as a sole counsel, one as first chair, and four as second chair. I am concerned that her lack of experience will be a problem when she gets to the bench.

It is not surprising to me that the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary gave her a partial ''not qualified'' rating. I am also concerned with her understanding of the proper role of a judge.

While in law school, she wrote a note that praised the Justices who wrote Roe v. Wade. She praised them for the willingness to ''forge ahead to create a just outcome without regard to the usual decisional restraints.'' Then, she said, ''The majority made the just decision and then forced history and stare decisis to fit that decision.''

Ms. Dorsey praised judges who made their decision—and I want to use her words—''without regard to the usual decisional restraints.'' Those words are not the kind of words judges should be using. That is not the kind of judges we want, those who are activist judges who impose their own policy preferences rather than in following enacted law or precedent.

What do we want? We want judges who will be restrained by precedent and by the laws Congress passes. Although Ms. Dorsey said she no longer supports what she once wrote, I am unconvinced she will be able to lay her policy preferences aside when they conflict with what the law dictates she ought to do.

For all the reasons I mentioned above, I cannot support the nominee. I have two news articles that describe the campaign contribution issue I discussed earlier. I ask unanimous consent that those articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Las Vegas Review-Journal, May 3, 2013]

DONATIONS TO REID-CONNECTED PACS LEGAL, BUT DON'T SEEM QUITE RIGHT

(By Jane Ann Morrison)

U.S. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid didn't break laws when he asked Las Vegas attorney Will Kemp to donate to the Senate Majority PAC to help elect Democrats in the 2012 cycle.

The senator, a lawyer himself, knew Kemp and Robert Eglet had won a huge verdict of $182 million from Teva Pharmaceutical Industries in a case in which large vials of Propofol were partially blamed for a hepatitis outbreak.

Kemp wasn't new to donating to Reid. He had been a donor to Friends for Harry Reid in the past 2010 cycle and had given $4,800. According to opensecrets.org, Kemp's largest donation in the past three years was for $8,500 to the Democratic Party of Nevada. And while he leaned Democratic, he also gave to some Republicans.

However, ethical questions abound about whether Reid's latest judicial nominee, Jennifer Dorsey, a partner in Jones, Kemp and Coulthard, could have seen—or hoped to see—her chances for an appointment enhanced by a series of contributions from Kemp and his partner, J. Randall Jones.

It's the time line and the size of the amounts that are creating that sewage smell.

Despite that, Reid said Friday he believed she would be confirmed by the U.S. Senate.

Check out what happened when:

October 2011: Kemp wins his big Teva case, not his first big payday as a longtime trial attorney.

Jan. 9, 2012: Kemp donates $8,500 to the Democratic Party of Nevada, generally considered the party designed to elect Reid first and foremost and other Democrats as an afterthought.

Sometime in January or February 2012, according to Kemp's statements to political analyst Jon Ralston, Reid asks Kemp and his partners to donate to the Senate Majority PAC. It's unclear whether his donation to the party fell before or after Reid's request. Kemp didn't return a call Friday to clarify the time line.

March 31, 2012: Dorsey donates $2,500 to Friends for Harry Reid. Sometime that month she expressed her interest in a federal judgeship. The same day, Kemp contributes $2,500 to the Friends of Harry Reid.

April 30, 2012: Reid returns her money but keeps Kemp's.

May 1, 2012: The day after Dorsey's money is returned, Kemp donates $100,000 to the Senate Majority PAC, and law partner Jones donates $5,000 to the Democratic Party of Nevada.

May 14, 2012: Two weeks later, Jones donates $50,000 to the Senate Majority PAC.

June 12, 2012: Reid recommends Dorsey to the White House.

Aug. 23, 2012: Jones donates $8,000 to the Democratic Party of Nevada.

Sept. 19, 2012: She is nominated by President Barack Obama.

Oct. 23, 2012: Jones makes a $10,000 contribution to the Democratic Party of Nevada.

At a meeting at the Las Vegas Review-Journal on Friday, I asked Reid to address the perception that the donations were made for a purpose.

He answered, ''It's too bad that her being a member of that law firm is causing some problems for her.'' He noted he had known Kemp for decades. ''He's one of the finest trial lawyers in the country, and that's not just hyperbole, that's true.''

Reid went on to condemn the Citizens United decision in January 2010, which allows unlimited corporate and labor money in campaigns as independent expenditures. Reid called it one of the four or five worst decisions in the history of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Reid said he abides by the rules and does not control the Senate Majority PAC. He asked Kemp to donate, but PAC officials dealt with the lawyer after that.

By my tally, based on the Open Secrets website, in 2012, Kemp and Jones between them gave $150,000 to the Senate Majority PAC and $28,500 to the Democratic Party of Nevada, and Kemp gave an extra $2,500 to Friends of Reid, for a total of $181,000.

In previous years, Kemp and Jones had given but not at that level.

In 2010, Kemp gave Reid $4,800; Jones gave him $11,700. Kind of a big jump from $16,500 to Friends for Reid in one cycle to $181,000 to Reid, the Majority PAC and the Democratic Party in the 2012 cycle.

That's a lot of Democratic lovin'. Especially for two lawyers who also pony up for Republicans.

Reid mentioned the nearly $150 million that Las Vegas Sands Corp. boss Sheldon Adelson had given to elect Republicans in 2012 and how a Rhode Island man made a federal judgeship though he and his wife donated $700,000 to Democrats since 1993.

While $150,000 sounds like a lot to me, Reid said it's all relative because the Senate Majority PAC raised more than $60 million.

Reid must be conflicted. He competes successfully at raising money, whether it's for his own campaign, the party or various PACs. Yet he says, ''I think this whole campaign finance thing has gotten way out of hand.''

Later he mused, ''It may not corrupt people, but it is corrupting.''

Dorsey, 42, said she doesn't talk to reporters. But if she knew her partners were donating all this money at the time she was seeking a judgeship (and how could she not know), she should have stopped it. But then she did donate $2,500 after asking for the job. Maybe she thought it was expected. Or maybe the judicial candidate's judgment about perception isn't so keen.

When her partners had never donated in such large sums before, it smacks of old-style payola. It may be legal, but it's not right.

However, I suspect the canny Reid is correct, Dorsey will get confirmed. Senators of both parties won't want to see their own donations restricted as they themselves race for the almighty dollar.

[From www.reviewjournal.com, Apr. 26, 2013]

JUDICIAL NOMINEE'S LAW FIRM GIVES $150,000 TO PAC LINKED TO HARRY REID

(By Steve Tetreault, Stephens Washington Bureau)

WASHINGTON.—As U.S. Sen. Harry Reid was considering Las Vegas attorney Jennifer Dorsey for a federal judgeship in May, two senior partners at her law firm made $150,000 in contributions to a political action committee associated with the Nevada senator, records show.

While apparently legal, the donations were called ''problematic'' by a legal expert, who said they could be perceived as attempting to buy a judicial appointment as Dorsey's confirmation is pending before the Senate.

Dorsey also made a personal contribution of $2,500 to Reid's campaign committee in March 2012, shortly after they initially spoke about her interest in becoming a federal judge, according to Senate records. Reid returned that contribution a month later, as he proceeded to check out her credentials and experience as a litigator.

In June, Reid agreed to recommend Dorsey to the White House for a post on the U.S. District Court, and she was nominated by President Barack Obama in September.

Reid in a statement said Dorsey's ''academic background and courtroom experience speak for themselves. She has great respect from her peers and colleagues in Nevada and I am confident she will serve the bench with distinction.''

As Dorsey was being vetted by Reid, senior partners at her firm, Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, made contributions to Senate Majority PAC, a super PAC created by former Reid strategists to elect Democrats to the U.S. Senate. Reid, the Senate majority leader, and other leading Democrats traveled extensively last year to raise money for the PAC, which is co-chaired by a former Reid chief of staff.

Founding partner Will Kemp made a $100,000 contribution on May 1, 2012, according to campaign finance records. Founding partner J. Randall Jones made a $50,000 contribution on May 14, 2012.

Reid declined comment on the firm's contributions to the political action committee. His spokeswoman, Kristen Orthman, emphasized that Dorsey's personal contribution to Reid's campaign was returned as the senator weighed her possible nomination and wanted to avoid an appearance of conflict.

Dorsey did not respond to requests for comment Thursday and Friday. A secretary at her office said the attorney usually does not comment to reporters.

Neither Kemp nor Jones responded to calls or to email queries made through their secretaries on Friday.

Lawyers making contributions to politicians and their causes is commonplace. Nor is it unusual for lawyers to want to see friends and legal partners ascend to the prestigious federal bench.

It's when the two appear to mix that problems can arise, legal experts said.

''This feels problematic to me,'' said Charles Geyh, John F. Kimberling professor of law who teaches and writes on ethics at the University of Indiana Maurer School of Law. ''There's no denying a perception problem here. Politically it seems like a dangerous thing to undertake.''

Carl Tobias, the Williams Professor of Law at the University of Richmond, cautioned against jumping to conclusions.

''I can't draw a cause-and-effect relationship'' between the partners' donations and Dorsey's nomination, said Tobias, a former professor at the Boyd School of Law at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. ''I think people could ask whether it appears that they were trying to promote one of their partners. You'd like to have the answers to those questions.''

Sen. Dean Heller, R–Nev., declined to comment on Friday. In recent weeks he has declined comment on Dorsey's nomination, saying he prefers to let the confirmation process move forward before saying how he would vote.

This week Heller declined an invitation to appear at Dorsey's confirmation hearing. Although Dorsey was nominated in September, only last month did Heller return the customary ''blue slip'' to the Senate Judiciary Committee, signalling that he did not object to a confirmation hearing.

Heller and Reid clashed earlier over Clark County District Judge Elissa Cadish, whom Reid had nominated to a federal judgeship but whom Heller had blocked over a gun rights dispute. Heller allowed Dorsey's nomination to proceed a few weeks after Cadish withdrew her nomination, leading to speculation that he and Reid had struck a deal.

Dorsey, who turned 42 on Friday, appeared Wednesday before the Senate Judiciary Committee for her confirmation hearing. The Las Vegas native obtained degrees from UNLV

and Pepperdine University School of Law. She became a partner at Kemp, Jones and Coulthard in 2004, where she has specialized in complex civil litigation.

Dorsey answered questions about her experience and her approach to the law posed by Sens. Mazie Hirono, D–Hawaii, Charles Grassley, R–Iowa, and Mike Lee, R–Utah. The senators seemed satisfied with her performance, said Tobias, who watched a webcast of the session.

Dorsey was introduced to the committee by Reid, who called her a ''fine woman who will be a great addition to the bench in Nevada. She has really a sterling reputation among her peers.''

Reid said Dorsey's nomination was in line with his desire to place more women on the federal bench. If confirmed, Dorsey would join District Judges Miranda Du and Gloria Navarro as Reid-backed Nevada federal court appointees.

In 1998, Reid backed attorney Johnnie Rawlinson for a District Court judgeship in Nevada, and two years later promoted her confirmation to the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

Dorsey has received a mixed rating from the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary, a 15–member panel that rates federal judge nominees on integrity, professional competence and judicial temperament, and on a scale of ''well qualified,'' ''qualified'' and ''not qualified.''

In Dorsey's case, the ABA said a ''substantial majority'' (10–13 members) rated her ''qualified'' while a minority rated her ''not qualified.''

Reid declined this week to comment on the rating, which matched ratings for Du and Navarro when they were under Senate consideration. He had made no secret of his disdain for the ratings, which he said rely too heavily on prior judicial service as opposed to ''real world'' qualifications.

In 2010, Reid said the examiners should ''get a new life and start looking at people for how they are qualified and not whether they have judicial experience.''

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM M. ''MO'' COWAN

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise today to say a few words about my friend who is leaving the Senate this week, Massachusetts Senator MO COWAN. I have to admit that when he first arrived I was excited because I was no longer going to be 100th in seniority. That job went to MO, and I would be 99. However, quickly after he was sworn in, I realized he was one of the nicest and smartest Members of this body. During his recent farewell speech, MO referred to me as the North Dakota sister he never knew he had. I already have six siblings, but I would welcome him into the Heitkamp family any day.

In all seriousness, MO was an excellent addition to this body. After the Boston massacre tragedy, he showed incredible leadership skills. He was a source of guidance and comfort to countless folks from Massachusetts in the weeks and months that followed that horrific act of terrorism.

During his short tenure, MO has distinguished himself in this body. First, MO listens more than he talks. His acute observation skills have made him a trusted adviser to many. Equally important, MO's observations are without judgment; rather, MO listens and tries to understand how he can advance the issue and not judge the speaker's motivations.

MO is a serious thinker, always trying to find a path forward to resolve the important issues of our time. I can only imagine the important and great legislation MO would have advanced if he had more time here.

Although MO is a serious guy, he also loves to laugh—mostly at his own expense. MO's desk in the Senate was often the gathering site for many freshman Senators because everyone was just a little happier and a little smarter after spending time with MO.

MO is also an extraordinarily humble human being—not the false modesty of a seasoned politician but the humility that comes from a deep faith and a lifetime of self-reflection. One should never mistake that humility for a lack of self-confidence. MO is very surefooted and anchored in the one great belief that his job is and always will be to make the world a more just place for his sons and for all the children of our country.

So beyond the ritual of carving a name in a desk and his recorded rollcall votes on important issues like immigration, what will be MO COWAN's Senate legacy? History may mark his time here in a footnote, but MO's impact has been much greater. I cannot speak for others in this body, but because I served with MO COWAN, I will be a better Senator. I will listen more and talk less. I will always remember not to judge the motivations of others; instead, seek solutions with others. I will redouble my efforts to make our great country a more just place for our children.

I will miss you, Senator MO COWAN. You are a great Senator, but more importantly, you are a wonderful and kind human being. Thank you for your service to our country.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on the nomination of Jennifer Dorsey to be a judge on the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada.

Jennifer Dorsey has spent her entire legal career at the Las Vegas, NV firm of Kemp, Jones & Coulthard, LLP, where she has been partner for the past 9 years. She has diverse experience in civil and criminal matters, trial and appellate work, and State and Federal courts, and has tried more than a dozen trials to verdict. The committee has heard from Judge Deanell Tacha, who was nominated by President Reagan to the Tenth Circuit and is now the dean of Pepperdine University School of Law, in support of Jennifer Dorsey. She wrote:

> I am well acquainted with Ms. Dorsey and can say, with full confidence, that she is an outstanding candidate for the federal judiciary who would serve with great distinction . . . She is a distinguished lawyer, a highly respected member of her community, and a true servant of the public good.

Her qualifications notwithstanding, Jennifer Dorsey has been the target of a false controversy over political donations made by her law firm colleagues. It is ironic that the same Senate Republicans who have filibustered any attempt to regulate or scrutinize political donations, and who objected to my request during the Bush administration to include political campaign contributions by nominees in the committee questionnaire, are now using donations by a nominee's colleagues to smear the nominee. These donations that the ranking member claimed he was concerned about were not even known to the nominee until they were reported in local newspapers. Ms. Dorsey has answered the ranking member's questions on this issue under oath and I consider it settled. Senate Republicans did not ask such questions of President Bush's nominees, even nominees who themselves made donations to President Bush or their home State Republican Senators after they knew that they were being considered for a judgeship. Perhaps now Senate Republicans think we should look at donations made by nominees' friends and neighbors?

This is just one more example of Senate Republicans playing games with President Obama's judicial nominees, rather than actually looking at the nominees' records. False controversies about nominees like Paul Watford, Patty Schwartz, Andrew Hurwitz, Caitlin Halligan, and Jeffrey Helmick over who they represented, or who they clerked for, demean the confirmation process.

Jennifer Dorsey is one of the 33 judicial nominees who needed to be renominated this year. Unfortunately, the Senate is not able to consider another district of Nevada nominee, Judge Elissa Cadish, whose nomination was withdrawn after the Republican Senator from Nevada refused to return his blue slip on her nomination. The concern with Judge Cadish seemed to be that in 2008 she had accurately stated existing Second Amendment jurisprudence. Judge Cadish was originally appointed to the Nevada bench by a Republican Governor, and in a 2011 judicial performance evaluation, conducted