

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

or turning farm waste into energy, farmers have taken a very active role in reducing the environmental impact of agriculture.

Research from the U.S. Department of Agriculture shows that even if the entire world was vegan, it would lower global emissions by less than one-half of 1 percent, while losing access to high-quality protein very much needed in the diets of human beings.

However, the facts that I have mentioned do not matter to radical environmental groups or the mainstream media. Articles on food sustainability often focus on how eating insects and bugs can help save the planet. A simple search on the internet reveals some unsettling articles in our publications. A headline from Time magazine reads like this: "How Humans Eating Insects Could Help Save the Planet."

Then from the publication The Atlantic: "To Save the World, Eat Bugs."

And from the New York Times—can you imagine, the New York Times: "Why Aren't We Eating More Insects?"

All of these stories have a very common thread—to solve world hunger and to protect the environment, the American people and the world need to eat bugs and insects. But as I have already laid out, you can just eat more beef and feel good about the environmental impact.

Now, as for me, I will be doing my part in May to honor National Beef Month. I will be eating juicy hamburgers or eating steak, if the price isn't too outrageous—and it is right now. I will be supporting cattlemen from Iowa who produce the highest quality beef in the world. Farmers know firsthand the importance of a clean and healthy environment. It is simply unfair to place the blame of a changing climate on the backs of farmers.

As a nation, we must stand with the farmers across the country and work with them to promote a clean environment. I will continue working at the policymaking table to ensure our cattle producers can continue raising high-quality beef for generations to come and that families can enjoy it at their kitchen tables at prices they can afford.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

STAND WITH TAIWAN ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I wanted to come down to talk about a topic that a number of Senators have been talking about and that a number of Senators have been focused on. That is the topic of Taiwan and potentially the defense of Taiwan and the support for Taiwan.

As this body knows, in 1979, the Senate passed a very important bill called the Taiwan Relations Act—a very bipartisan bill. From that time on, the Senate has played a very important oversight role in U.S. relations with Taiwan, and it has always been very bipartisan.

Recently, a bipartisan codel, led by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator MENENDEZ, with many other Senators—Senator GRAM, Senator PORTMAN, Senator SASSE—traveled to Taiwan. I just got an out-brief from some of those Senators—a very good meeting. I was part of a bipartisan codel about a year ago, with Senator COONS and Senator DUCKWORTH, also to Taiwan.

So there is a long tradition in the U.S. Senate, in a bipartisan way, with all of us working together, of addressing this question: To what degree should we be supporting and defending Taiwan against a very aggressive Chinese Communist Party, led by the dictator Xi Jinping? Why does it matter? Why should we all be working together, as we have done for decades here in the U.S. Senate, Democrats and Republicans, to deter a military invasion of Taiwan?

What will be happening in the next few weeks I want to talk about because I am concerned about the direction of the Biden administration, and I think every Senator here should be concerned. So I am going to ask my colleagues to lift up their voices when they talk to the Biden administration on a topic I am going to mention here in a minute. But why does it matter? Well, this issue of the potential invasion of Taiwan could take place in a few years.

The INDOPACOM commander, a little over a year ago, in front of the Armed Services Committee, opined that the threat of an invasion of Taiwan by an aggressive Chinese Communist Party would manifest itself during this decade—"in fact, in the next 6 years." That was Admiral Davidson, former INDOPACOM commander, and that is not a lot of time.

Here is why I think it matters: Right now, Taiwan is on the frontline of freedom in Asia. It is not some peripheral sideshow; it is, in many ways, central to freedom in that part of the world like West Berlin was during the Cold War. A violent military takeover of Taiwan by the Chinese Communist Party would be a sea change in how the entire world is ordered. It would change the history of the 21st century in the way that the Guns of August of 1914 changed the 20th century.

Now, some see the defense of Taiwan and the support that is required from the United States because of the Taiwan Relations Act—again, led by this body—some see the defense and support of this island democracy as a luxury that we can't afford in an age shaped by great power competition.

I actually believe—and I believe many Senators, Democrats and Repub-

licans, believe the opposite—that a Taiwan under China's control would decisively advance Beijing's campaign to export its authoritarian model around the world; to separate the United States from our democratic allies; and it would certainly be part of Xi Jinping's goal of excluding the United States from the INDOPACOM theater.

Taiwan—a thriving, prosperous Chinese democracy that holds free election and bounds its power by the rule of law—is central to the free world and its future.

By the way, if you are an American citizen, regardless of political party, you should take pride in the fact that this country—or this island democracy—is free because it wouldn't have happened without the sacrifice and resources of the United States and our military, and that is a fact.

A few months ago, I gave a speech on this topic, and I talked about how, when you think of the defense of Taiwan and deterrence, which is what we all want—deterrence; nobody wants a war in the Taiwan Strait—there are really three layers of deterrence for the island of Taiwan.

The first is Taiwan's ability to militarily defend itself, the so-called hedgehog approach or porcupine approach. Right here, they are defending themselves in the way the Ukrainians are defending themselves. Senator ROGER WICKER had a very good op-ed in the Wall Street Journal just today on that very topic. We need to make sure Taiwan has that capability—it is in the Taiwan Relations Act that we have that responsibility—so that it can defend itself, and they are undertaking the right approach with regard to the military weapons they are buying from the United States and other places.

The second level of deterrence that you see here on this chart would be America's capability to defend Taiwan militarily should the President of the United States decide to do so if there is an invasion by the Chinese Communist Party. Over several decades, through many different crises in the Taiwan Strait, this layer of deterrence, wherein the United States has shown up with military force, has proven to be decisive in keeping the Taiwanese people free, and our deep network of allies in the region augments this second level of deterrence.

But there is also a third level of deterrence. The third level of deterrence is often not discussed, but in many ways, particularly now, it could be more powerful than the first and second levels, and that is the level that relates to bringing in the instruments of American power beyond our military, such as our global economic and financial strengths, to deter China from an invasion. You see this third level: economic and financial sanctions.

This is exactly what my bipartisan bill, the STAND with Taiwan Act, would do. I am working with several Senators on this bill right now. We