

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 671.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Andrew B. Davis, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 671, Andrew B. Davis, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

John Thune, Bill Hagerty, Tim Sheehy, Jim Banks, Ted Budd, Katie Boyd Britt, Bernie Moreno, Tommy Tuberville, John R. Curtis, Mike Rounds, John Barrasso, Pete Ricketts, Kevin Cramer, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Ted Cruz, Rick Scott of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BANKS. Mr. President, last week over the recess, I had the opportunity to visit Taiwan coinciding with the 47th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act. After I left Taiwan, I went to Japan and visited Tokyo, visited with many of our troops and some of our military bases and was briefed there as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

What I got to see last week I believe was President Trump's national security strategy—the new national security strategy—in action. So I wanted to come this afternoon to the floor after returning—I am still a little jet-lagged from my visits overseas, but I wanted to spend a few minutes today talking about what I learned and how President Trump's new national security strategy is already making the United States more secure.

Through his bold actions in Venezuela, Iran, and beyond, President

Trump is demonstrating that America is stronger when the President acts unapologetically in defense of our national interests.

When the new National Security Strategy was introduced last September, many so-called foreign policy experts started immediately denouncing it.

Op-eds were written that said that because the security strategy focuses on the Western Hemisphere, that somehow means we are no longer prioritizing our competition with China. That is total hogwash. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I want to stick to the facts today about what the National Security Strategy really means. The new National Security Strategy describes the “Trump Corollary” to the Monroe Doctrine. The Trump corollary is about restoring “American preeminence in the Western Hemisphere” and about protecting “our homeland and our access to key geographies throughout the region.”

As the strategy makes clear, this is not a global retreat but an example of strategic focus. While we tackle the many national security strategies and challenges around the world, we must never lose sight of the issues that arise in our backyard. Securing the Western Hemisphere is necessary to project power to other regions around the world.

We have already seen the many ways that this strategy has played out. Early in his second term, President Trump announced that the Gulf of Mexico would be renamed the “Gulf of America.”

And, Mr. President, I know that you saw this too. Many people thought this was some kind of a joke. Those same so-called foreign policy elites made fun of President Trump for the name change. They said it was a joke, but, really, there is nothing that is funny about it. Renaming the gulf to the “Gulf of America” was a mission statement. It announced that America would dominate the Western Hemisphere once again and that America would lead on its own home turf.

Since then, President Trump has taken action in Panama, Venezuela, and perhaps soon even in Cuba, and America is better, safer, and stronger because of those operations.

President Trump's security strategy isn't something new. Since our Nation's founding 250 years ago, the United States has repeatedly kicked out foreign adversaries from the Western Hemisphere. European powers like the French, the Spanish, the British, and the Russians all tried over time to dominate in the region, but the United States never let that happen.

I think about President Teddy Roosevelt a lot in this era, in this new era—a lot of similarities between him and President Trump. President Teddy Roosevelt was unapologetic about acting in defense of America's interests. From Venezuela, to the Dominican Re-

public, to Panama, Teddy Roosevelt used military power to make sure that it was only America that ruled in her own backyard, and President Trump is bringing back this tried-and-true strategy.

Several weeks ago on the Senate's Armed Services Committee, we heard from the Under Secretary of War for Policy, Elbridge Colby, who is the key architect of this updated National Security Strategy. I had the chance to ask him some questions about our military actions and our strategy, what all of this means. Secretary Colby agreed that when we clean up our own backyard, we are not retreating from the rest of the world. In fact, securing our hemisphere is absolutely necessary to project power to the Indo-Pacific region and beyond. Imagine what it would be like if we had foreign adversaries in our backyard while we had to mobilize our forces in the event of a crisis. The results could be catastrophic.

The surest way to prevent simultaneous adversary aggression is to have fewer adversaries. In Venezuela, China has already lost one client. In Cuba, they may soon lose another. Even as combat operations continue, President Trump has already degraded substantially Iran's military capacity to act in coordination with other enemies.

By any count, President Trump is making a list of our enemies and neutering or outright eliminating them one by one. The result will be a safer, more secure world, with fewer threats. That allows us to concentrate our military power where it matters most: in the Indo-Pacific.

Here, the National Security Strategy makes another key contribution to deterrence. Rather than focusing simply on the defense of Taiwan, the NSS draws connective tissue across the entire first island chain, interlinking security issues from the Philippines through Taiwan to Japan. As I saw firsthand in the region, this broader view advances U.S. interests while better supporting the needs of our allies and partners who are positioned at the tip of the spear.

President Trump is backing up this strategy with a historic investment in our national defense in the form of a \$1.5 trillion defense budget that he has recommended to us in Congress. These investments are already resonating with our friends and allies around the world. In fact, in Taiwan, I spoke with President Lai, who is likewise proposing a defense budget of over a trillion dollars in Taiwanese dollars. As I urged leaders from Taiwan's legislature, I hope Taiwan passes this badly needed increase in short order.

Thanks to President Trump, America's key partnerships in the first island chain have never been stronger. We now have the strategy, the resources, and the will to leverage our military power to back them up. This is a combination that will serve American interests for years to come. I can't

think of anything that is more “America First” than that.

The National Security Strategy as updated by the Trump administration—Secretary of War Hegseth, Secretary Elbridge Colby, and President Trump himself—is really historic. It is an “America First” foreign policy agenda that is already making the United States safer and stronger.

As we near the 250th birthday of this great country—the greatest country in the history of the world—President Trump has positioned our Nation to be the most powerful that it has ever been, and that is something that is really worth celebrating.

What a big difference just a couple of years has made. From historic weakness in the Biden administration—I will never forget the disastrous pull-out, the deadly pullout, the shameful moment of what happened in Afghanistan and what the Biden administration did to politicize and weaken our military. What a difference 2 years has made from that to President Trump restoring peace through strength through his actions, through what he has done to restore the military and rebuild the military, and also through this National Security Strategy.

I thank the Presiding Officer for his time with that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4293

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I rise today to ask unanimous consent in a few minutes that the Senate pass my legislation, the No Funding to Honor Crime Scenes Act.

Last month, America was shocked to learn that Cesar Chavez, who was famous for his leadership in the Civil Rights Movement, had a long history of preying on women and children. It is appalling that someone hailed as a hero for the rights of farmworkers was in the meantime molesting the very people he was supposedly advocating for. Perhaps it is even more shocking that his misconduct was actually widely known within his social and business circumstances and that the victims were encouraged to remain silent in order to protect this man’s legacy.

As a father of two daughters, I consider child sexual abuse one of the most heinous crimes you can imagine, which is why I have long been an advocate for victims of human trafficking and sexual assault.

America should not celebrate the legacy of Cesar Chavez, nor use taxpayer dollars to do so. It should also not pay for and maintain the Cesar E. Chavez National Monument, which stands at the very scene of some of his crimes. It must be closed. For this reason, I have introduced legislation to defund any Federal tribute bearing Cesar Chavez’s name and nullify President Obama’s Presidential proclamation that enacted this monument in the first place.

The No Funding to Honor Crime Scenes Act would direct the Secretary

of the Interior to immediately close the monument and sell any and all Federal land that includes Chavez’s home, his grave site, the memorial garden, and any contents of his personal office, which is where we know child sexual abuse occurred.

Not only would it close the monument glorifying this disgraced perpetrator, but it would go one step further to right the wrong by helping victims of abuse. My legislation would direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer any funds set aside for the monument to the Debbie Smith Act, which supports survivors by providing State and Federal law enforcement agencies with resources to complete forensic analyses of crime scenes and untested rape kits.

I have led the reauthorization of the Debbie Smith Act many times with bipartisan backing, and I would hope this legislation would receive that very same support here today.

Taxpayer dollars should never be used to celebrate the abuse of women and children.

I urge the adoption of the legislation.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I would ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4293, which is at the desk; further, that the bill be considered read three times and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the sexual assault, the abuse that Ana Murguia, Debra Rojas, and Dolores Huerta have described is horrific, and it necessarily and profoundly changes Cesar Chavez’s legacy and how he should be remembered. I am extremely grateful to the women who have courageously stepped forward. Many, like Dolores Huerta, feared that speaking up would enable those who had always opposed the workers movement to erase it, along with Cesar Chavez, and I stand here today to ensure that is never the case.

The movement Dolores Huerta and so many others fought for was bigger than any one man, and when we learn shocking or terrible things about our history, the right answer is to tell the truth, never to hide it.

I am concerned that what my colleague from Texas is proposing could do just that—hide the truth about Cesar Chavez and, unfortunately, the incredible farmworkers movement with it.

The legislation that Senator CORNYN is asking us to approve today would not only abolish the Cesar Chavez National Monument, it could erase the foundational history of the farmworkers movement in the process. It would follow through on the threat that silenced the survivors of Chavez’s abuse.

Let me be clear. I agree unequivocally that we should no longer have a

monument named after Cesar Chavez, but we absolutely should not erase the monument’s telling of the story of the farm labor movement. That is a story that belongs to many people, including the survivors of Chavez’s violence.

Abolishing the monument would serve only to sweep his violence under the rug, and it would sweep the stories of Americans involved in the farmworkers movement under the rug with it. This is a movement that wasn’t just founded by a single man; it was a movement because it was propelled by the many. Among those leading it was Dolores Huerta, a native New Mexican and a hero to an entire generation of Hispanic and Latino men and women alike. If we erase this monument, we also erase her work, her legacy, and the countless other leaders in this photo from the monument.

The monument may be named after one man, but we can change that, and we can change that without erasing the history of tens of thousands of American farmworkers across decades, including the history of his victims. That is an effort that is, in fact, already underway—expanding the mission and scope of the monument to encompass more of the histories of the farmworkers themselves. This includes incorporating the stories of Filipino Americans in California whose long history of advocacy and activism for farmworkers’ rights deserves to be remembered and lifted up.

The rich legacy of farmworkers in building and sustaining this country is proof that a national monument dedicated to their story and their movement for fair labor practices should persist.

The question is, What should happen to this monument? What should happen to it next should include input from survivors and from other Americans involved in the farmworkers movement. I do not know, frankly, what they will say, but I do know what I have already heard.

Yesterday, I received a letter from multiple organizations that included the Hispanic Access Fund and the Asian and Pacific Islander Americans in Historic Preservation. What those groups made clear is that they do not support abolishing this national monument, saying that it would “erase the nationally significant story of the broader Farmworker Movement, including the many leaders, activists, and workers who fought for dignity and fair wages.”

These groups just want a voice in what happens next, and they point out quite clearly that the legislation being considered now was crafted without having that conversation with all the affected communities.

That is why I will ask to amend my colleague’s proposal to instead temporarily close the monument and require the National Park Service to complete a new special resource study for the monument in consultation with all of those who are part of the farm labor