

sensitive information, the detection and handling of security incidents, and other areas determined relevant by the Director;

(C) facilitating access to cybersecurity personnel and training of research and support personnel; and

(D) the requirements for controlled unclassified or classified information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, the committee-reported substitutes are considered and agreed to, the bills, as amended, are considered read a third time and passed, and the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The committee-reported amendments, in the nature of a substitute, were agreed to en bloc.

The bill (S. 254), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The bill (S. 318), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I want to let people know back home that means that that bill, the ARTIST bill that we have been trying to get moved for a long time, just passed the U.S. Senate. So I want to thank my colleague from California, my friend from California who has worked with me, by the way, on one of the other bills that just passed. I was a cosponsor with Senator PADILLA on that, so this is good Senate cooperation on these issues.

So that is an important issue for Alaskan Native heritage, culture, artists, and now it has passed the Senate. So, again, I want to thank Senator PADILLA.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 410

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, now I hope we can move to the next bill that, to be honest, should be even easier because the bill I am going to try to pass right now passed the U.S. Senate in December, unanimously. It already passed, so this should be a no-brainer. I hope my Senate colleague from California is on the floor here ready to give this bill his full endorsement and not object to it.

Let me just talk about this bill, briefly. Again, it already passed. It passed the House in July, so if we pass it right now, it is going to go to the President of the United States' desk for a signing. And this is a really big deal for my constituents.

Here is what it is: I talked about what I called the special patriotism of Alaska Natives. They serve at higher rates in the military than any other ethnic group in the country.

They had a situation when so many—and I mean thousands and thousands—of Alaskan Natives were serving in Vietnam. When a whole host of Americans didn't want to serve in Vietnam, Alaska Natives answered the call. So

we have tens of thousands of Vietnam vets.

And when they came home, like a lot of Vietnam vets, they were not treated well. That was horrible. Our country should apologize for the horrible treatment our Vietnam vets got. Let's face it, as Alaska Natives, a lot of people still discriminated against Alaska Natives back then. They weren't treated well in that regard either. And, finally, a law had changed when they were overseas.

Alaska Native people used to have a right, starting in 1906, for a Native allotment; that is, 160 acres of land that if they can prove this is where their family raised them and hunted and fished, they could get that allotment—160 acres.

Well, when they were overseas fighting in Vietnam, that law changed. So here they were serving their country—when a lot of American males were avoiding service—and they got home, and they were told: By the way, your allotment that you are supposed to be able to get, that you wanted your whole life, that allotment changed, and you can't do it anymore. Huge injustice.

So during the first Trump administration, I introduced legislation called the Alaska Native Vietnam Veterans Land Allotment Act. And it said: Hey, if you were overseas serving in the military and you came home and the ability to get your allotment extinguished, you shouldn't be penalized for fighting for your country. You get the extended time to get your allotment. So that bill passed.

I was in the Oval Office when President Trump signed it. It was a great day for Alaska Natives, Vietnam veterans, very patriotic. It was a 5-year program. Unfortunately, we had Secretary Haaland implement it. Secretary Haaland did not implement it. Secretary Haaland, when she went through her confirmation hearing, committed to me twice: Senator, I will make this a priority of mine to implement this bill. You know what she did? She didn't do anything.

Shamefully, because radical leftwing environmental groups told her: We don't want anyone else getting land in Alaska, she did 40 allotments out of well over almost 3,000 available. She dragged her feet. She delayed it for 2 years.

So the 5-year program has almost run out of time because Secretary of the Interior Haaland was more interested in appeasing radical leftwing environmental groups than she was getting Alaska Natives their allotment, which is what the law demanded.

So this bill is very simple. Because of that delay, it changes two words in the already passed law. It says "5 years" to "10 years." It is just a 5-year extension to a bill that everybody agrees with.

These patriotic Alaska Native Vietnam vets deserve their allotments, and they shouldn't have to suffer because of Secretary Haaland's delay tactics.

So this bill has already passed the House. This bill passed the Senate unanimously in December, and I am really hoping that my Democratic colleagues—respecting the indigenous Native people of my State and their valiant Vietnam service—will join with me in just passing it, like we did in December, and it will go right to the President's desk, and they will have 5 more years to really implement this really important piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 410 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am very glad that we were able to find a bipartisan approach to the Commerce Committee bills that were passed just a few minutes ago, not just because I know it is important to my colleague from Alaska and to his constituents, but so that Native Alaskans know that this side of the aisle also supports them as well.

But as it pertains to these bills, I think we need to find a similar bipartisan approach on the Energy and Natural Resource bills that the Senator from Alaska is suggesting that we approve by unanimous consent. I am more than happy and eager to sit down with my colleague and the chair and ranking member of the committee to put together a larger package of bills to ensure that both Republican and Democratic priorities reach the President's desk and get signed into law.

I think, historically, we have been successful at avoiding a piecemeal approach, instances where only one party's priorities or one Chamber's priorities reach the President's desk and get signed into law.

And so I look forward to continuing to work in that spirit to continue the conversation with my colleague from Alaska to arrive at a balanced, bipartisan package of bills and work together to advance them. Therefore, I must object at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from California's cooperation on the first bill, the ARTIST Act.

I am a little disappointed here on this one because, you know, it is a little bit of a delay tactic, but he certainly has my commitment to work with him, if they need to try to pair this. But I will say this: The 5 years of this bill expires at the end of this year, and we cannot—regardless if there is pairing or not pairing—we cannot let this bill expire. These great American

patriots served their country and deserve their allotment that they were unable to get during Vietnam. And then, when we passed the bill, Secretary of Interior Haaland purposefully dragged her feet to make sure that no Alaska Native—or very few—got their allotment. That was a disgrace.

And so, Mr. President, to my colleague from California, you have my commitment to work with you, but we have got to get this done by the end of the year—before the end of the year—and get it on the President's desk. These great patriotic Americans deserve nothing less, and we can't delay much longer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to complete their remarks prior to the scheduled rollcall vote: Senator GRASSLEY, Senator CRAMER, and Senator HOEVEN.

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

The Senator from Iowa.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Mascott nomination.

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

NOMINATION OF JENNIFER LEE MASCOTT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, we are going to move to our first vote on Professor Jennifer Mascott's nomination to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. I want to take a few minutes to express my support for her nomination and to urge my colleagues to vote accordingly.

Bipartisanship in this body has become, unfortunately, rare. Our government shut down because of partisan obstruction, and even the few instances of bipartisanship in our committee have been condemned by leftist, dark money groups, such as Demand Justice. The situation is bad for our country and really bad for the American people.

Putting high-quality judicial nominees on the bench to serve the American people should be something that unites this body. In fact, in the Biden administration, that happened. Over 80 percent of the judicial nominees in that administration received bipartisan support on the floor.

By contrast, this Congress, only 20 percent of the Trump nominees have had bipartisan support.

I encourage my colleagues to ignore the pressure from inflammatory progressive groups like Demand Justice and to recognize Professor Mascott's tremendous qualifications.

Professor Mascott is a law professor at Catholic University. She is so beloved by her students. She has had a very distinguished career as a public servant and has impeccable professional qualifications.

Just as an example, as a law student at George Washington University, she earned a recordbreaking 4.22 GPA. Her professors even wrote to the Judiciary Committee prior to her hearing to explain that these professors often thought that her exam answers were better than their own answer keys.

It is no surprise, then, that she went on to clerk for two Supreme Court Justices.

Since her time as a clerk, she has grown into an impressive and nationally influential scholar. Justices of the Supreme Court have cited her scholarship eight times and even mentioned her by name in oral arguments.

She is also well known and well respected by our own Senate Judiciary Committee. The committee has called on Professor Mascott repeatedly to testify about some of the toughest constitutional and statutory questions. She has also filed amicus briefs on behalf of Members of the committee in very important cases. We trusted her judgment then, and we can surely trust that judgment now.

I am confident that Professor Mascott will make an outstanding judge, and I know that she will serve the people of Delaware and the circuit with distinction.

President Trump made an excellent selection in Professor Mascott, and I hope my colleagues will join me in voting to support her nomination so she can serve on the Third Circuit.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I just want to supplement the distinguished chairman's remarks with one observation for the benefit of all of my colleagues, and that is that, not long ago, when circuit court nominees were brought forward, they had cleared the Senate blue-slip process because each circuit court seat was associated with a State, except for DC. But, normally, a DC Circuit Court seat was associated with a State, and the Senators from that State had the ability to recommend a nominee to the President.

The Republicans on the Judiciary Committee undid that—what we call the blue-slip rule—for circuit courts. So Senators lost that power.

When we were in the majority, when President Biden was there, there were strident objections when we applied the same standard to circuit court nominees that the Republicans had applied when they broke the blue slip.

With this nomination, we are taking it the next step further. Now, not only are the Senators from the home State not consulted, but in this case, the candidate has almost no relationship with Delaware, the State with which this seat is associated.

She has a summer house there. She has never had a driver's license. She has never had a fishing license. She has never been an income taxpayer. She has never been registered to vote. She has never been a member of the bar.

She only recently joined the Third Circuit bar.

She is being airdropped into this seat.

So just be aware that, in the future, when the shoe is on the other foot and people here would like to make sure that their home State is honored and recognized as being the State with which a circuit court seat is associated, that may very well not happen any longer. And we will look back to this minute as the minute that destroyed that tradition.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

S.J. RES. 62

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, in a little while, we are going to vote to proceed to S.J. Res. 62, which I introduced with Senator HOEVEN to repeal the Biden administration's Bureau of Land Management resource management plan for North Dakota.

Of course, H.J. Res. 105, which mirrors our bill, introduced by Congresswoman FEDORCHAK, has already passed the House of Representatives, and final passage is scheduled for later this evening.

The Bureau of Land Management—or BLM, as we call it—is the landlord of 745 million acres of land and subsurface deposits nationwide. BLM's management of these public resources is governed by what is known as the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, otherwise known as FLPMA, which requires—I stress “requires”—the Bureau to develop resource management plans or RMPs to guide management decisions.

And, when created, Congress was clear: These RMPs must abide by the multiple-use mandate.

Now, “multiple use” is a term that is thrown around a lot in the public lands discussions. It was championed by President Theodore Roosevelt, who drew from his experience in his two ranches in North Dakota, the Maltese Cross and the Elkhorn Ranch, and throughout the West.

And, by the way, North Dakota is where his Presidential Library is being built, and it will be open next July 4—unpaid announcement.

“Multiple use” means that land is sustainably used by the State and local population, rather than preserved like a national park or a wildlife refuge. Multiple use lands are used by miners, cattle grazers, oil and gas developers, and recreationalists alike. They are not meant to be locked up.

Multiple use is a mandate, as I said earlier. It is not a suggestion. And that is what brings us here today.

In the final days of the Biden administration, they approved the North Dakota resource management plan, which governs the management of 58,500 surface acres and 4.1 million acres of mineral estate across our State for the next 15 to 20 years.

Despite vocal objections from the State, the people who actually use the

land, the final plan prohibits coal leasing on over 4 million acres by inexcusably prohibiting all future development outside of a 4-mile radius from current development—over 90 percent of North Dakota's affordable, reliable coal, out of touch. It is gone.

It also blocks 213,000 acres, or 44 percent, of federally owned oil and gas acreage from future development. This restriction alone deprives the State—and we are a small State—of \$34 million annually and—get this—the State's Common Schools Trust Fund a minimum of \$50 million.

And if that wasn't enough, non-Federal minerals are also held hostage to the Federal Government's management plan. As I mentioned earlier, these RMPs govern subsurface acreage. Whether it is coal, oil, or gas, federally owned subsurface minerals are intermingled with State and private mineral owners. In plain speak, the Biden resource management plan is a de facto taking from the State and private mineral owners.

Throughout the rulemaking process, this point was made very clear, but BLM ignored it. And it is unacceptable and needs to be undone. And I will add that it needs to be undone by Congress so it is clear to the bureaucracy that this sort of resource management plan is out of bounds.

By passing this resolution, we reassert congressional intent and remind the bureaucracy: Our boundaries are not optional.

Mr. President, this rule will need to be replaced once we repeal it. Thank goodness Congress had the foresight in the Congressional Review Act to say no replacement rule could be substantially similar to the one it is replacing. But by no means does it preclude the proper replacement of a rule.

I have the utmost confidence in Secretary Burgum and Deputy Secretary MacGregor to get this done right, but this cannot sit on the back burner.

Nearly 6 years ago, during the first Trump administration, I wrote a letter on behalf of a single constituent advocating for this RMP to be updated so he could develop some of his privately held minerals. They started the work, but unfortunately the Biden administration finished the work.

While Congress is acting to repeal their disastrous plan today, the administration must swiftly replace this RMP, ensuring North Dakota gets the best long-term plan possible to responsibly utilize our natural resources.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the resolution that Senator CRAMER and I introduced to overturn the Bureau of Land Management resource management plan for North Dakota.

This flawed plan, finalized during the closing days of the Biden administra-

tion, undermines BLM's multiple-use mandate and restricts access to vast, taxpayer-owned energy reserves in North Dakota. It is yet another example of the Biden administration's overreaching Green New Deal agenda intended to block access to domestic energy production.

North Dakota is an energy powerhouse and the third largest oil-producing State in the Nation. Our energy producers operate under the highest environmental standards in the world.

But the Biden administration's North Dakota resource management plan ignores that record of responsible energy development. Instead, the North Dakota resource management plan seeks to curtail coal, oil, and gas production by locking away taxpayer-owned energy reserves and jeopardizing our Nation's energy security.

Under this plan, nearly 213,000 acres—or 45 percent—of Federal oil and gas acreage is closed off to new leasing. It also closes off access to over 4 million acres—nearly 99 percent—of Federal coal, impacting development at all of North Dakota's major lignite coal mines.

These restrictions will drive up supply costs for baseload coal-fired powerplants—costs that will be ultimately passed on to electric customers across the region. We supply a large region of the Midwest with electric power.

This comes at a time when energy demand is rising. As manufacturing is brought back home and new industries like artificial intelligence and data centers are coming online, our need for affordable, reliable energy is only growing. It makes no sense for the Federal Government to restrict access to the very resources needed to power our economy.

In North Dakota, BLM manages 58,000 acres of surface land and about 4.1 million acres of subsurface minerals. Federal minerals are scattered and often intermingled with State and privately owned minerals due to North Dakota's unique split estate. So when the Federal Government imposes blanket restrictions as included under the Biden-era resource management plan, it blocks development of State and privately owned minerals as well.

The State of North Dakota estimates that this plan would cost \$34 million every year in lost revenue from oil and gas alone, including revenue for school trust lands that is meant for North Dakota classrooms.

I am pleased to join Senator CRAMER and Congresswoman JULIE FEDORCHAK in introducing this CRA resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it and help overturn this overreaching and restrictive plan. By passing this resolution, we can continue working with President Trump and Interior Secretary Burgum to take the handcuffs off and unleash North Dakota's full energy potential.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

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. 459, Jennifer Lee Mascott, of Delaware, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

John Thune, Jim Justice, Ashley B. Moody, Steve Daines, Thom Tillis, Rick Scott of Florida, Roger Marshall, David McCormick, Tom Cotton, Kevin Cramer, John R. Curtis, Marsha Blackburn, Lindsey Graham, Pete Ricketts, Mike Lee, Ron Johnson, Mike Rounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jennifer Lee Mascott, of Delaware, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 552 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Banks	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Moreno
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeven	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Curtis	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	McCormick	Young
Fischer	Moody	

NAYS—47

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warmack
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallago	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NOT VOTING—3

Cruz	Mullin	Tillis
------	--------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 47.