

Agriculture is already a challenging industry by its very nature. Many farmers and ranchers in South Dakota, for example, are currently dealing with a severe drought, and inflation is making things a lot worse, especially right now in the midst of planting season.

We all know how we got here. Democrats came into office last year mere weeks after Congress had passed a fifth bipartisan COVID relief bill totaling more than \$900 billion, and meeting essentially all of the current pressing COVID needs.

It was abundantly clear that we were not in immediate need of trillions more in government spending.

But that didn't matter to Democrats. Now that they were in charge, they were eager to take advantage of the COVID crisis to begin implementing their Big Government vision.

And so in the name of "COVID relief," they pushed through a massive partisan \$1.9 trillion piece of legislation filled with unnecessary spending and handouts to Democrat interest groups.

And the result was entirely predictable.

The definition of inflation is too many dollars chasing too few goods and services, and that was exactly the situation that Democrats helped create.

Democrats flooded the economy with unnecessary government money and the economy overheated as a result, and there is no clear end in sight.

It is small wonder that, after months and months of high inflation and anti-growth policies from the Biden administration, our economy shrank in the first quarter of this year.

Unfortunately, there is no easy solution to the inflation crisis Democrats helped create.

One essential thing, of course, is to do no more harm, and that means no more excessive government spending and no bloated Build Back Better tax-and-spending spree, a spending spree that some Democrats are still—still—advocating for.

Another essential thing is to unleash American energy production, and that includes conventional energy production.

I am a strong supporter of clean energy. I come from a State that, in 2020, derived 83 percent of its energy generation from renewables.

But no matter how much Democrats and the President might wish it were otherwise, the fact of the matter is that our Nation is nowhere close to being able to eliminate our reliance on traditional energy sources. Clean energy technology is simply not advanced to the point where we can replace all conventional energy production with renewables. And cutting off investment in clean, responsible oil and gas production will do nothing but drive up energy prices for American families, farms, and businesses.

Unleashing American energy production, on the other hand—including, I might add, production of oil and nat-

ural gas—could quickly result in relief for families and businesses and help ease our inflation crisis.

Unfortunately, the President has made his hostility to conventional energy production very clear. He set the tone on day 1 of his administration when he cancelled the Keystone XL Pipeline, an environmentally responsible pipeline project that was already underway and that was paired with \$1.7 billion in private investment in renewable energy to fully offset its operating emissions. The Keystone Pipeline was set to be what they call "net zero"—net zero—when it comes to emissions.

The President also immediately froze new oil and gas leases on Federal lands. And while his administration is finally conducting sales for new onshore oil and gas leases after being ordered to do so by a Federal judge, it has reduced the land available for such leases and substantially increased the royalty rate, sending a loud and clear signal to American energy producers that the administration is reluctant to collaborate with them.

Meanwhile, the Securities and Exchange Commission has proposed requiring publicly-traded companies to comply with costly new climate-related disclosures that would likely discourage investment in conventional energy production.

In short, the Biden administration is creating a recipe for sustained high energy costs and a lot more pain for American businesses and families.

But I and my Republican colleagues will continue to do everything we can to unleash conventional energy production here at home and drive down energy prices for Americans.

I am grateful for all that small businesses contribute to our economy, and during this National Small Business Week, and every week, I will continue to work to mitigate the harm of Democrats' inflation crisis and advance policies that make it easier for our small businessmen and -women to continue to drive the American economy forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Texas.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I know we are used to having a lot going on here in Washington, DC, but this week seems like we have been hit by a whirlwind of activity—a war in Europe, COVID-19 still lingering in parts of the world, and then the Supreme Court found itself the victim of an unauthorized leak of a draft opinion, which has created a lot of furor and anxiety and misinformation.

One of the things that it has demonstrated is the need to protect the independence of the Court.

Justice Antonin Scalia used to say that you can read the constitution and bill of rights of a lot of countries around the world, and they look great on paper. He mentioned that of the old Soviet Union, for example. But he said

they are just words on paper without an independent judiciary to enforce them, and he was right.

Whoever leaked this draft document obviously intended to create a lot of public pressure—indeed, coercion—on the sitting Justices to either change their minds or to somehow garner a political issue that they would be able to use to divert the American people's attention from things like inflation, crime, the border, and the challenges to our national security and world peace.

We have to get to the bottom of this, and I am confident that Chief Justice Roberts will pursue that until the person who leaked it is identified and held accountable.

But this spotlight on the Court, along with the reaction—the public reaction that we have seen has raised another important issue, and that is the physical safety and security of the Justices themselves and their families.

In our increasingly polarized climate, the Justices have been villainized and subjected to violent threats. People have even published their home addresses so they can show up and protest on their home, on their property, on their lawns.

This decision, which is actually a nondecision because the Supreme Court hasn't handed down its decision—but the leaker has accomplished his or her goal, I suppose, by creating this hostile environment for the Justices and their families.

But, unfortunately, there are even people in this Chamber who have contributed to that environment.

In 2019, the Democratic leader went to the Supreme Court steps and threatened two Supreme Court Justices by name. He said:

You have released the whirlwind—

By the way, this was the day that the abortion case was argued in the Supreme Court.

The senior Senator from New York, the majority leader, said:

You have released the whirlwind, and you will pay the price. You won't know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions.

And he named Justice Gorsuch and Justice Kavanaugh by name.

Now, to have the senior Democrat and Senate majority leader from this Chamber lobbying threats at sitting Justices on the Supreme Court if they did not rule in a way he wished is dangerous.

We have wondered before about the impact of some of the irresponsible rhetoric that occasionally occurs around here on vulnerable minds and people who might be tempted to act based on that incitement, based on that rhetoric. But to have this come from the majority leader himself is just irresponsible.

This is the branch of government, which is supposed to be the adults in the room, to operate in a way that is respectful, even with our differences, and the Supreme Court is the branch

that is meant to operate free from public or political pressure.

As Chief Justice Roberts said at the time: “Justices know that criticism comes with the territory.” It is a free country. People can express themselves within limits. “But threatening statements,” he said, “of this sort from the highest levels of government are not only inappropriate, they are dangerous,” he said. Well, Chief Justice Roberts is right, and subsequent events have shown that threats against the Justices aren’t going away and are becoming even more intense.

We need to take steps to improve the protection of the Justices and their family against potential violence, and it can’t wait until something bad happens. Some political activists have already announced their intentions to go to the private homes of the Justices. This is an appalling violation of their personal privacy. It puts them and their families at risk. We currently have two Justices with school-aged children. Once Judge Jackson joins the Court when Justice Breyer steps down, there will be three.

The Chief Justice has asked Congress to take appropriate action to increase protection for the physical safety of the Justices and their families, and we need to act and act with urgency.

Senator COONS, our friend from Delaware, a Democrat, and I are introducing a bill, a bipartisan bill, obviously, called the Supreme Court Police Parity Act to strengthen security protection for the Justices and their families. This will ensure the Justices receive the same protection and resources that article I and article II officers and their families enjoy. For our present purposes, that means they will be given the same authority that the Capitol Police already have here on Capitol Hill.

I appreciate our friend Senator COONS working with me on this important legislation, and I hope the entire Senate will vote on it soon.

As far as the larger debate about the draft document that was released, it is important to remember we don’t actually know what the Supreme Court is going to decide until it actually does decide. The Justices are still working through the deliberative process, and our respect for the independence of the Court requires that we let it proceed without interference.

While tensions and emotions may be high, it is important to note that overruling earlier Supreme Court decisions is nothing new. I looked back and realized it was 1789 when the Supreme Court reversed its first prior decision. Since that time, there have been 232 instances where an earlier Supreme Court decision was overturned. And, I must say, thank goodness the Court is willing, under some limited circumstances, to revisit its earlier decisions.

The Court’s decisions overruling earlier precedents in some cases has fundamentally altered major aspects of

our society. Without question one of the most notable was *Brown v. Board of Education*. Now, *Brown v. Board of Education* was a landmark ruling overruling a case called *Plessy v. Ferguson*, which established a shameful “separate but equal” doctrine between Blacks and Whites in public transportation and public schools. *Brown* said that is fundamentally discriminatory and will not stand because it doesn’t meet the constitutional standards. But it is tough today to imagine what our country would look like had the Supreme Court not reached its decision in *Brown* nearly 70 years ago. Classrooms, restrooms, water fountains, and even healthcare facilities would be designated by race. I am confident that I can speak for everyone in this Chamber when I say thank goodness the Court overturned *Plessy v. Ferguson* and reached the ruling that it did in *Brown v. Board of Education*.

There are more modern examples where the Court overruled precedent, like *Lawrence v. Texas* was overruled in 2003 by the precedent established by *Bowers v. Hardwick*, which had made it a crime to be engaged in same-sex conduct. So without a doubt, the Court’s decision to overturn its precedents has altered our society, and I suggest it has changed our society for the better in many of those instances.

Now, I realize that given our political and ideological preferences, we might like or dislike the decision that the Court ultimately makes, but former Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson said years ago that the Supreme Court is not final because it is right; it is right, he said, because it is final.

But there is no such thing as an inviolable decision or permanent decision by the Supreme Court, and again I say thank goodness. If prior decisions were set in stone, we would still be subject to egregious, shameful policies of the past like “separate but equal.” But the Supreme Court should always try to correct previously decided erroneous decisions, and they have criteria under the doctrine known as *stare decisis* for the circumstances under which they will revisit that precedent. The Court understands that they can’t willy-nilly overrule earlier decisions, and there is a very elaborate and exacting process and evaluation of analysis by which they do so.

But I believe it is our responsibility here in the Senate not to be part of the mob. Cooler heads must prevail. And that means us. It starts with us. We have to stand for the independence of the Court even when they render decisions we don’t like. That is the only way to preserve the crown jewels of our form of government, which is the independent judiciary. The High Court cannot be subjected to pressure campaigns by anyone—elected officials, political activists, or anyone else.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

NATIONAL BEEF MONTH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to celebrate with my colleagues the month of May as National Beef Month, and I come to the floor not just to say that we ought to eat more beef and help the farmers and cattlemen of this country.

Before I get to something else, though, Iowa has the seventh largest cattle inventory in the United States and ranks fourth in the country for cattle and calves on feed. While I usually focus on the need for a fair and transparent market for cattle producers, today I want to draw attention to the job that cattle producers across the country have feeding America and the world.

Over the last 30 years, the U.S. population has increased by 80 million people. In that same period, the world’s population has grown by more than 3 billion people. In the face of a growing population, farmers across America have been faced with a challenging question: How do we meet the growing demands for food while also lowering our environmental footprint?

American farmers and ranchers have risen to that occasion; in other words, not just producing more food but helping the environment at the same time. Farmers in all segments have expanded production to fulfill increasing demand while protecting our environment. The United States is currently producing 80 percent more pork, 48 percent more milk, and 18 percent more beef than just 30 years ago.

Now, you would think, with all that increase in production, you would have more of an environmental problem, but despite the increases in production, per unit greenhouse gas emissions from pork production have decreased by 20 percent and 8 percent for beef production.

Nonetheless, environmentalists still seem to place unwarranted blame on farmers for contributing to our changing and warming climate. The recent narrative that U.S. agriculture is a major contributor to greenhouse gas emissions is simply not true. Now get that—it is simply not true. According to the EPA, only 11 percent of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions come from agriculture. The leading sources of greenhouse gas emissions contribute nearly twice as many emissions as the agriculture industry does. Transportation contributes 27 percent, electricity contributes 25 percent, general industry is contributing 24 percent. So I am here to set the record straight. For the last 30 years, American farmers have been reducing greenhouse gas emissions with each meal served by embracing efficiency and the adoption of new technologies.

Agriculture needs to have a seat at the table for these conversations because farmers are the first conservationists and can help offset emissions from other sectors of the American economy. Whether it is creating carbon sinks on farmland to produce biofuels