

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 I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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 sure-footed 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 roll-call 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 re-nominated 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

by the Las Vegas Review-Journal, 88 percent of the lawyers who responded said she should be retained on the bench, which was among the highest of all judges evaluated. So I remain disappointed that her nomination was withdrawn and that the Judiciary Committee and the Senate were not permitted to consider it, especially since the vacancy to which Judge Cadish was nominated is now a judicial emergency vacancy.

In addition to the 33 renominations at the start of this year, President Obama has nominated another 28 individuals to be circuit and district judges this year, and has now had more nominees at this point in his presidency than his predecessor did at the same point. Senate Republicans are nonetheless criticizing President Obama for making too few nominations while protesting that the fact that many vacancies do not have nominees cannot possibly be the fault of Senate Republicans. These Senators are saying that they have no role in the process. Of course, only a few years ago, before President Obama had made a single judicial nomination, all Senate Republicans sent him a letter threatening to filibuster his nominees if he did not consult Republican home State Senators. They cannot have it both ways.

I take very seriously my responsibility to make recommendations when we have vacancies in Vermont, whether the President is a Democrat or a Republican, and other Senators should do the same. After all, if there are not enough judges in our home States, it is our own constituents who suffer. It should be only a matter of weeks or months, not years, for Senators to make recommendations. Republican Senators who demanded to be consulted on nominations should live up to their responsibilities, and fulfill their constitutional obligation to advise the President on nominations. They should follow the example of Democratic Senators: the administration has received recommendations for all current district vacancies in States represented by two Democratic Senators. When Senate Republicans refuse to make recommendations for nominees, and then delay votes on consensus nominees, they are not somehow hurting the President, they are hurting the American people and our justice system.

Mrs. HAGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all remaining time be yielded back.

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

Mrs. HAGAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jennifer A. Dorsey, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada?

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) is necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 170 Ex.]

#### YEAS—54

Baldwin	Hagan	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Pryor
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Boxer	Hirono	Reid
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kaine	Sanders
Cardin	King	Schatz
Carper	Klobuchar	Schumer
Casey	Landrieu	Shaheen
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Levin	Tester
Cowan	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden

#### NAYS—41

Alexander	Enzi	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Chambliss	Inhofe	Scott
Chiesa	Isakson	Sessions
Coburn	Johanns	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Corker	Kirk	Toomey
Cornyn	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	McConnell	Wicker
Cruz	Moran	

#### NOT VOTING—5

Begich	Flake	McCain
Coats	Graham	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid on the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:35 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

#### KEEP STUDENT LOANS AFFORDABLE ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclu-

sion of my remarks, the Senator from Utah be recognized.

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

Mr. REED. I wish to thank the Senator from Utah for graciously allowing me to proceed.

While the Republicans failed to join us in an effort to avert the doubling of the interest rate on need-based student loans, there is still time to act to make things right for students. On July 1, the interest rate on subsidized Stafford loans doubled from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. Instead of allowing us to take up a vote on an extension of the lower rate, the other side continues to push a so-called long-term solution that would saddle students with even more debt in the future.

Students and advocates from across the country have been very clear. On June 21, they wrote to Senate leadership, and in their words: "A bad deal that is permanent for student borrowers is worse than no deal at all."

We need time to work together to develop a good deal for students—one that is comprehensive, one that touches not on just rates but on incentives to lower the costs of a college education and on ways in which students can refinance their existing debt and their future debts. As we all understand, we have reached a point where student debt has exceeded credit card debt. It is the second largest household debt—\$1 trillion—and it is saddling this generation and future generations with burdens they well might not be able to discharge.

In the meantime, at this moment, we should take up and pass the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act which I have offered, along with Senator HAGAN and 41 of our colleagues, to ensure that students with the greatest financial need do not see the interest rate on their loans double. Again, at the heart of our student lending program has been a special concern to allow young men and women with talent from low and moderate incomes to go to college. That is why we created the subsidized Stafford loan program. That is what we have to keep our focus and emphasis on today. Forty-nine organizations representing students, educators, colleges and universities, and workers from across the country have asked us to do this. These are the students, the universities, and the people who have most at stake and they are telling us, again, that a bad deal is worse than no deal at all.

We should take a step back and remember why we offer student loans in the first place. When President Lyndon Johnson signed the Higher Education Act into law in 1965, he said: "And it is a truism education is no longer a luxury. Education in this day and age is a necessity."

His words are truer today than they were in 1965. According to Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce, we will fall 5 million