

They don't elect us to argue. They elect us to solve problems.

To my great gladness, there are Republicans who are willing to solve these problems. Senator LANKFORD is one of them. Senator SINEMA, an Independent, Senator LANKFORD, and I sat in a room for 4 months, and we negotiated a bipartisan compromise—a compromise—that would allow us to get tougher on our southern border, to make sure that only the right people are coming into the United States, those that have a legitimate claim of asylum, those that are legitimately fleeing terror and torture. That would create a more compassionate, more effective, more efficient system of immigration.

We were engaged in this process because Republicans demanded it. Republicans said: We want you to pass bipartisan immigration reform. We want you to get to a result. We will vote for it if you achieve that result.

They selected Senator LANKFORD as the chosen negotiator.

We achieved that result. Senator MCCONNELL was in the room for those negotiations. It was endorsed by some of the most conservative outlets and organizations in the country, including the Chamber of Commerce, the Wall Street Journal, and the very conservative Border Patrol union. But it only got four Republican votes.

So I want to talk for just a minute about why that happened, what the bill does, and why it is important that we have another vote this week.

First, let's just talk briefly about what this bill does.

Probably first and most importantly, it fixes the broken immigration system, the asylum system in particular. Right now, you come to this country and apply for asylum, it takes sometimes as long as 10 years before you get your claim heard. That is not fair. That is not fair for the individual who is applying, but that is not fair for others who are waiting outside of the country to try to come to the United States. It is not fair for communities that ultimately have to house and provide services for all of those individuals who are waiting to apply for asylum. So this bill fixes that broken system. It takes that 5- or 10-year wait down to weeks or months.

This bill gives the President emergency authorities to close down portions of the border when crossings get too high. You can't handle 10,000 people a day at the border. We all know that, Republicans and Democrats. The American public knows that. They saw that chaos at the end of last year. This bill says the President, whether you are Republican or Democrat, has the emergency authority to close down the border during times of high crossings.

This bill makes significant investments in combating fentanyl. My colleagues have talked about the scourge of fentanyl, hundreds and hundreds of people dying in my State, thousands across this country. This bill invests

significant new resources in stopping the flow of drugs across our border. It is a \$20 billion investment overall. Much of that money is targeted toward fentanyl.

Then it just takes a bunch of commonsense steps to treat those who are coming to the United States in a more humane way. It says that if you are coming here and you have a legitimate claim of asylum, you should be able to work while your claim is being processed, that you should have a right to a lawyer during that process, that we should provide a little bit of money for young kids, for 8-year-olds to have representation. It provides a pathway to citizenship for certain really critical populations, including Afghans, including the children of H-2B holders.

Inside this bill are a number of really important reforms, and the system just makes more sense, it is more effective, it is more humane. But at the foundation of this bill is border security—making sure we have a border that is manageable, that is not chaotic.

I agree with my colleagues—this bill does not do everything we need to do to reform our broken immigration system. Of course I want a pathway to citizenship for people that are living in the shadows. I want to make sure that those kids who know nothing except for being Americans have a chance to stay here permanently. But this bill is a really important downpayment—a really important bipartisan downpayment on border security and immigration reform.

The question is, Why did it fail? Why did a bill that had the support of Senator LANKFORD, the appointed negotiator, and had the support of Senator MCCONNELL fail? And the answer is simple: Donald Trump told Republicans to kill the bill. Donald Trump told Republicans that their party would be better off if the border was a mess, if nothing passed, because more Republicans would get elected this November if there were scenes of chaos at the border. So even though you have a bipartisan border bill, kill it because politically it is better for Republicans if the border is a mess.

That is not my analysis; that is literally what Republicans have said on the record repeatedly. Senator MCCONNELL said it himself, said: Donald Trump told us to do nothing. Senator MCCONNELL didn't say: Donald Trump told us to write a better bill; he said: Donald Trump told Senate Republicans to do nothing.

So that is why we are here today, because the American public wants us to pass bipartisan border security legislation, Democrats want to pass bipartisan border security legislation, but as far as I can tell, Republicans do not because they want the border to be a mess.

We will see tomorrow. We will have another chance. If this is an emergency like Republicans say, then let's give it one more shot.

Let me end with this because I do think it is important to just explore

for a minute why keeping this issue of immigration unsolved, keeping the border chaotic, is so important to Republicans and in particular to Donald Trump. The reason is that making Americans afraid of each other, turning us against each other, is the centerpiece of Donald Trump's message and thus, for this election at least, the centerpiece of the Republican platform.

The idea is to keep the border broken, to keep the immigration system broken because it helps breed and maintain resentment towards immigrants, towards people that are different from you.

Just last month, Trump said this. He said: Immigrants are not human; they are animals.

I mean, if a major political figure said that 20 years ago, there would be, I think, Republicans and Democrats both standing up and condemning that kind of language. Donald Trump calls immigrants animals, says they are not human—he says it on a regular basis—and he is celebrated by Republicans.

I wish this weren't true. I wish it weren't a foundational aspect of modern republicanism to try to turn us against each other, to try to make us afraid of people who are coming to this country just to save their families' lives, but that is where we are. That is where we are. But that doesn't obviate us from the responsibility to govern.

So Republicans can complain that we are asking them to vote on a negotiated, bipartisan compromise, because it is inconvenient for them to vote against a bill that was endorsed by high-profile Senate Republicans and by high-profile conservative groups. It is inconvenient for them to vote against a bill that actually brings security to the border, that fixes the problem that they want to be fixed, but that is our job.

Our job is to come here and not just do press conferences, not just search for clicks online. Our job is to fix problems, and the broken border and our broken immigration system is a problem. This bill doesn't fix all of those problems, but it is the biggest fix we have had a chance to vote on in a generation.

So, yes, we need to vote on this again to give Republicans the chance to do the right thing, to choose the security of this country, to choose fixing a problem that they identify instead of choosing to try to gain some political advantage in this election, instead of choosing to continue to double down on this strategy of dividing Americans from each other. That is why we are voting tomorrow.

I am hopeful that Republicans and Democrats will come together to support this important, bipartisan border security legislation.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF DENA M. COGGINS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Dena Coggins to the U.S. District

Court for the Eastern District of California.

Born in Sacramento, Judge Coggins received her B.S. from California State University, Sacramento, and her J.D. from the University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law. She then entered private practice, where she worked on general litigation and family law matters. From 2013 to 2015, she worked as a deputy legal affairs secretary for then-Governor Jerry Brown. Judge Coggins later served as a supervising attorney and hearing officer at the California Victim Compensation Board and as an administrative law judge at the State of California's Office of Administrative Hearings. As an administrative law judge, she presided over more than 150 evidentiary hearings or trials that resulted in proposed or final decisions. Since 2021, Judge Coggins has served as a judge on the Superior Court of California in Sacramento County. In that role, she has handled assignments in both the criminal division and juvenile court. Judge Coggins has presided over approximately 100 juvenile dependency trials, and she has served as the presiding judge of the Juvenile Court since 2023.

The American Bar Association rated Judge Coggins as "well qualified" to serve on the Eastern District of California. She has deep ties to the district, and she enjoys the strong support of her home State Senators and the California legal community.

Judge Coggins's litigation background and her courtroom experience as an advocate, administrative law judge, and State court judge ensure that she will be an asset to the district court. I am proud to support her nomination, and I ask my colleagues to join me in my support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from California.

#### NOMINATION OF DENA M. COGGINS

Ms. BUTLER. Madam President, in just a few moments, this Chamber is going to consider the confirmation of Judge Dena Coggins to be U.S. judge for the Eastern District of California, and I would proudly want to rise and speak in support of her confirmation.

Before I begin, I do want to appreciate that Judge Coggins's family is watching proudly and eagerly the Senate floor today. Her mother, Cynthia Ambrose, Judge Coggins's son Elias and her daughter Elaya, who I met during their nominations hearing—I know they are excited about the opportunity today for their mother to continue her public service at the highest levels in one of the busiest districts in the State and in the country. And so I just want to take the time to thank Ms. Coggins's mother, Ms. Ambrose; Elias; and Elaya for supporting their mom, their daughter. She, indeed, is an incredible woman.

If confirmed, Judge Coggins will join the Federal bench at a critical moment for California's Eastern District. The Eastern District of California is currently seeing an average of 803 filings

for each judgeship on the court. That caseload level is the sixth highest in any Federal district in the country.

And given her remarkable track record serving Californians from all walks of life, I have the utmost certainty and confidence in Judge Coggins's readiness for this role. Her work ethic, integrity, and unwavering commitment to the rule of law make her an exceptional nominee to meet this moment with the urgency that it demands, and I am confident that she will be successful.

Born and raised in Sacramento, Judge Coggins has devoted her career to serving the community in which she was raised. She completed her undergraduate degree at California State University Sacramento, received her Juris Doctorate degree from the University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law in Sacramento. Judge Coggins began her career in general litigation and family law, where she built a strong reputation as a skilled litigator with experience in both Federal and State court.

From 2015 to 2017, and again from 2018 to 2021, Judge Coggins served as an administrative law judge at the State of California's Office of Administrative Hearings. In this capacity, Judge Coggins presided over more than 150 evidentiary hearings and trials. She also served as supervising attorney and hearing officer for the California Victim Compensation Board, where she oversaw legal proceedings and ensured that victims of violent crimes receive the compensation and the support that they needed.

Since 2021, Judge Coggins has served in the Superior Court of California in Sacramento County. She has handled assignments in both the criminal division and the juvenile court. And since 2023, she has served as the presiding judge of the juvenile court, presiding over 100 juvenile dependency trials.

I will also note that if Judge Coggins is confirmed, she would be filling the seat currently held by Chief Judge Kimberly J. Mueller, who was the first woman to ever serve on the district court of California and for whom Judge Coggins served as an extern early in her legal career.

Judge Coggins is an experienced jurist who has seamlessly transitioned to and excelled in numerous roles on the State bench. The respect and reverence she has earned is validated by the overwhelming support she has received since her nomination, including a letter written by several of her colleagues at the State bench addressed to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Speaking of her service on the juvenile court as a juvenile court judge, they said:

She is a humble and quiet leader, not seeking the spotlight or the fanfare, simply working day in and day out to improve the court. We know when she speaks, she has put considerable thought into her words and that her reasoning and judgment are sound.

They go on to say:

In the courtroom, she also demonstrates her steady and fair temperament. She is thorough and diligent. Judge Coggins is efficient with her time on the bench and has handled substantial caseloads. She analyzes issues in a careful and balanced manner and provides thoughtful, well-reasoned, and common-sense decisions. She is compassionate to all who appear before her and takes time to understand the impact each decision will have on them.

Judge Coggins is exactly the kind of jurist that we need in the Eastern District and has exactly the kind of experience California's Federal bench needs. Her legal intellect, her composure, her record as an effective, efficient, thoughtful jurist makes her a strong nominee.

And her appointment to the bench comes at a historic time. Just this morning, we marked the milestone of confirming President Biden's 200th appointment to the Federal judiciary, including 1 Supreme Court Justice, 42 Circuit Court judges, 155 District Court judges, and 2 judges to the U.S. Court of International Trade.

President Biden has nominated and the Senate has confirmed 126 non-White Federal judges, more than any President in history. The majority of these judges are women—127 exceptionally qualified jurists. Notably, the professional diversity of these confirmations are so remarkable and unprecedented, including public defenders and other legal backgrounds whose perspectives and experiences have not been fully represented on our Federal bench.

With this in mind, confirmation of Judge Coggins's nomination is a part of our broader work to strengthen our judicial system. So I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her confirmation to the Eastern District of California.

I yield the floor.

#### VOTE ON COGGINS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Coggins nomination?

Ms. BUTLER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent; the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 179 Ex.]

#### YEAS—50

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Brown
Bennet	Booker	Butler