

days as President. He knew that title IX was written to protect women, not erase them. His leadership stood for fairness, science, and common sense.

But there is no guarantee the next President is going to uphold President Trump's action. This bill would make those protections permanent. The Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act is simple. It says that, under title IX, "sex" means the person's reproductive biology at birth. That is how title IX was written. That is how title IX was understood for decades, and that is how title IX should work today.

Men and boys shouldn't compete against women and girls in female sports. It is just common sense. It is absolutely just plain common sense.

Yet, 2 days ago, every single one of my Democratic colleagues voted against protecting women's collegiate athletics. They chose the wrong side of an 80-20 issue. They chose not to fight for science, for equal opportunity, and for women and girls.

I urge them to reconsider. Let's stand with women over radical policies. Let's stand with the overwhelming majority of Americans. Let's keep a level playing field for our daughters and granddaughters. Again, I urge my Democratic colleagues to reconsider.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I think everyone so enjoyed listening to the State of the Union Address last night, and for so many Tennesseans—we have heard from them today—they were excited, they felt hopeful, and they also are watching very closely what the actions of the House and the Senate are going to be.

Now, many of them have mentioned that they know we have that March 14 funding deadline coming up, and so, in 9 days, the Federal Government would be running out of money. And they have heard my colleagues from across the aisle talk about shutting the government down and making that choice to shut the government down because they don't want to pass a budget.

But if you shut the government down, then you are not going to be able to move forward on President Trump's agenda. We know they are not for that agenda, but what they are missing is that the American people are for President Trump's agenda. They want to see the border secure. They want inflation to come down. They want crime in the cities to be dealt with. They want our standing in the world to be returned. They support President Trump.

And we know that when President Trump was returned to the Oval Office, he was given a powerful mandate from the American people, and he deserves to have his agenda shape government spending. But we know there is little time left, and so we begin to hear those conversations that we usually hear about having a continuing resolution.

Now, the reason conservatives like me oppose that is because it continues

the current spending, and that is a Joe Biden budget. And we know that, under the Biden administration, they literally ran the numbers off the government credit card. They were spending so much money. They have driven this Nation's debt to \$36.5 trillion.

This pandemic and post-pandemic spending has left every single American spending \$1,060 more per month to buy the same basket of goods and services they were buying in 2021. Now, think about that. That is the result of Bidenflation: \$1,060 more a month to buy the same basket of goods and services you could buy 4 years ago—because we know what has happened with Bidenflation. We know the true rate of that inflation is, cumulatively, over 20 percent.

It is not what they wanted to say—core inflation is only 3 percent or it is only 4 percent. Anybody that buys milk and eggs knows that is not right. And, of course, it is going to take a while to get those numbers down, to look at the prices of gas and groceries and rent and utilities.

And we know that the Biden budgets are what have fueled this growing debt, this annual deficit that we have seen, and the fact that now, when you look at every single American, their portion of our Nation's debt is now \$107,000—\$107,000.

I was talking to a friend this week who has a new baby—just arrived, brandnew—and they are so excited to once again have a little baby in their family. And as we were talking about politics and all that was going on and the excitement of the baby, I said: And when you look at the Federal debt, their share, their "welcome to the world" present from the U.S. Federal Government: You now, as a U.S. citizen, share in this \$36.5 trillion debt to the point of \$107,000.

I think the American people know that our fiscal path would lead us to disaster if we do not change what we are doing, if we do not look at where we are spending this money.

Thank goodness that President Donald Trump has taken the time to look seriously at what the Federal Government spends and, yes, to work toward moving us to a balanced budget.

Now, one of the ways that he is doing this—and, yes, there have been Executive orders and there has also been the implementation of the Department of Government Efficiency. We refer to this as DOGE.

Today, some of us have had the opportunity to listen to Elon Musk and his team who are carrying out the work at the Department of Government Efficiency.

DOGE, so far, has found \$105 billion of inefficiencies in the Federal Government—\$105 billion. They are finding about \$4 billion a day. The President went through a list last night of some of the waste that is there for projects that maybe really do not yield a result that will benefit the hard-working taxpayer.

We also heard about fraud and people that are receiving Social Security checks that maybe don't exist, people that might be 125, 150, 160 years old, even over 300 years old. That is fraud. And we all are very hopeful that we are going to be able to close that loop, find out who these individuals are, and make certain that they are prosecuted and that money is returned to the U.S. taxpayer.

This is a huge step toward getting our fiscal house in order. Yet these savings that we are finding are only going to be made official and permanent when we put them into the congressional budget.

Now, we all know that this requires us to go through the rescission process. This requires us to codify these reductions so that they are removed from the budget in future years.

We know that that is going to require us to get back to regular order on the budget as we go through this process, as we work through reconciliations, making certain there is a clear path to end continuing resolutions, return to regular order, return to a budget document, and be able to deliver.

I will tell you this: When I talk to Tennesseans, they want transparency. I think one of the things they have so appreciated about DOGE is that they have a website. They are putting all of this information on the website. They are putting it on their X account, but they are showing the American people what they are doing, where they are finding waste, where they are finding fraud, and how they are being able to address this.

This means that as we work through this, we are going to have to take our actions. We are going to have to return to that regular order. We are going to have to bring these spending bills to the floor, and we are going to have to insist and vote for and support a balanced budget so that we begin to reduce, first, eliminate our deficit for the year, and then target balancing our Federal budget and beginning to reduce our debt.

I am so pleased that President Trump talked about this last night in his State of the Union Address because it is important not only for today, tomorrow but for our children and grandchildren's future. He mentioned this—the sovereignty, the stability of our Nation.

What we want is to make the tough choices today, to make the spending reductions today, so that in the future, our children have a nation that is firmly sovereign and is able to stand whatever comes our way.

I think it is so interesting that in 2010, the summer of 2010, Admiral Mullen was asked the question: What keeps you up at night; what worries you the most; what is our greatest threat to our Nation's freedom?

His response was our Nation's debt, and we all know that debt has doubled since that point in 2010 when he made that comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). The Senator from Oklahoma.

PROTECTING WOMEN AND GIRLS IN SPORTS

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, this body knows from just my conversations in the hallways that I am a proud dad of two amazing daughters. They are remarkable young ladies that I am terribly proud of.

I was also one of those dads that was up way before dawn when they were in middle school and high school because they were cross-country runners. Cross-country runners in high school have a long-term saying that their sport is other sports' punishment.

They are there at 6 a.m., stretching out and running a mile so they then can prepare to go run 5 or 6 more just to be able to get ready for cross-country meets in the fall. They were remarkable athletes in high school and enjoyed that.

They ran with guys and ladies when they were training, in all of their time in the training time, because the team was a team of guys and girls. But when they actually got to the competition day, my daughters competed against other girls in that competition because what we all know to be a fact, to be true, is that boys in cross-country that are training for cross-country and girls that are training in cross-country—both great athletes—have different times to the finish line. That is just a reality. It is not one negative on another. It is not diminishing one to another. It is a reality.

In the last Summer Olympics, the woman who was a remarkable athlete that won the women's marathon as the greatest runner of our time, when she came in as the Gold Medal winner, her time would have been beaten by 67 of the men who ran in the Olympics in the same sport, same distance, same track—gold medalist for the women. The top 67 men running in the marathon would have beaten her.

Where am I going with this? This is common sense that we all know and that we have all seen in our own families and in communities. It is the reason that we have protected women's sports for years to be able to make sure that women and girls have the ability to be able to have great competition, to enjoy the joy of sports and all the lessons that you learn from sports, and to be able to have equal competition levels.

But in the past few years—really, very, very recently in our country—there is a movement to be able to say if a biological male, transgender individual, wants to be able to compete in the women's sports area, they should be allowed to do that.

The question is, Whom is that fair to? Is that fair to this transgender individual or is that fair to the other female athletes? Because culturally, there seems to be a push to say I don't care if it is unfair to the female athletes. I picked this one transgender individual, and I want to be fair to them.

I look at a whole team of other folks to say: Whom is this fair to? This

seems like basic common sense that 15 years ago wouldn't even have been a dialogue in our country. Fifty years ago, it wouldn't even have been in discussion in our country, but now we are having this dialogue. This is not about disrespect for any individual or the rights of individuals to be able to make choices in their own life. It is about respecting the rights of women and girls in their sport to be able to compete on a level playing field to make sure they are able to thrive in their sport the same as men are able to thrive in their sport and to enjoy the thrill of competition without the intimidation of someone crossing over into their sport to be able to take it away from them. It doesn't seem reasonable.

For some reason, in this room, contrary to the rest of the country, this is some kind of irrational conversation. It is not. It is basically common sense. But in this room, we just had a vote this week to be able to say women should compete in women's sports, and men should compete in men's sports.

In that vote, just to begin the debate on the bill to say let's open it up for amendment, let's talk about this as a concept, every single Republican for just that simple of a bill said: Let's start debate on this and figure out where we are going to go.

Every single Democrat said: I don't want to even debate this. This is not up for discussion.

Well, it is up for discussion, but where it is up for discussion is in homes and families and communities all over the country because in homes and families and communities all over the country, there are lots of dads like me of amazing daughters that are saying: I don't want my daughter to compete against a biological male because there are inherent advantages in some sports and in some speeds just based on bone density and muscle structure.

Again, it is not negative toward female or male on that. It is reality and basic biology.

Families across the country are talking about this, and for some reason this room is allergic to talk about it. Well, we are going to continue to be able to bring this up because Americans have an expectation that this is going to be resolved. I am grateful to President Trump that he has rescinded the Biden administration's Executive order allowing transgender individuals to compete in girls' sports. That is a good thing. That sets ladies across the country at ease to say: Let's go play soccer; let's go run in cross-country; let's go do the sports we want to be able to do and not have to worry about somebody hitting me in the face at high speed in a volleyball game but to go compete on a level playing field.

That is a good thing. But it is an Executive order. That means it doesn't last from President to President to President. I don't know what the next President is going to do, but I think I know where Americans are still going to be.

They are going to want to say: Let's compete. We may all train together; we may be all friends together; we may all hang out with each other at school, but when the competition comes, give me a fair, level playing field for competition and watch people compete and enjoy the sport. That is what sports have been about, at least that is what they used to be about. Now, they seem to be about political messaging instead.

So we are going to continue to be able to bring this up. I am grateful to Coach TUBERVILLE for the work he has done on this and grateful to President Trump for the work he has done on it. But it is unfinished business at this point, to the great frustration of a lot of families around the country, including in my own State of Oklahoma.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 108

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in recent weeks, several Federal judges have issued orders blocking unlawful actions taken by the Trump administration. In response, the administration's officials and allies have made worrisome statements criticizing Federal judges and the process of judicial review. Elon Musk, an unelected bureaucrat who is assisting this administration, has repeatedly called for the impeachment of Federal judges and questioned the lifetime appointment of Federal judges that is enshrined in article III of the Constitution.

President Trump's choice of Deputy Director of the FBI, Dan Bongino, suggested on a podcast that the President set up a fake courtroom in the White House where "he can just start making judicial decisions." Mr. Bongino added:

If the judge is the executive, why can't the executive be the judge? Ask your stupid liberal friends that.

As a reminder, Mr. Bongino is second-in-command at the FBI, the most powerful investigative Agency in the world. If he sounds like a political animal out of his element, you would not be wrong.

But Mr. Bongino is not alone. Last week, a nominee to a senior position at the Department of Justice testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee:

There is no hard and fast rule about whether, in every instance, a public official is bound by a court decision.

Let that sink in for a moment. This is a person who wants a senior position at the Department of Justice testifying under oath and saying:

There is no hard and fast rule about whether, in every instance, a public official is bound by a court decision.

In a social media post, Vice President VANCE falsely asserted that "judges aren't allowed to control the executive's legitimate power." This is merely the latest in a long line of claims by the Vice President that a President can defy court orders.

President Trump himself recently posted: