

move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 552, H.R. 8337, a bill making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2021, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Richard C. Shelby, Lindsey Graham, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Tom Cotton, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roy Blunt, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, Cory Gardner, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, Mike Crapo, Rob Portman, James E. Risch, John Hoeven.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

(The remarks of Mr. ENZI, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. BARRASSO pertaining to the introduction of S. 4684 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ENZI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

REAFFIRMING THE SENATE'S COMMITMENT TO THE ORDERLY AND PEACEFUL TRANSFER OF POWER

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 718, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 718) reaffirming the Senate's commitment to the orderly and peaceful transfer of power called for in the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 718) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I would like to speak to the resolution.

It is a shame that we have to come and reaffirm our commitment to our country, to our Constitution, and who we are as a people and how we became the greatest country on Earth and the freedoms we all take for granted many, many times.

Sometimes we hear things that challenge that. We heard that yesterday, and we were very concerned about that.

As of today, my friend and colleague from Indiana, Senator BRAUN, basically

wanted to reaffirm our commitment to the Pledge of Allegiance, which is something we should do every day—our Pledge of Allegiance to our flag and to our great country.

What we are doing with this resolution is basically saying that the bedrock of democracy is the orderly and peaceful transfer of power when a President transitions out. This should not be a question. There should not ever be one iota of interruption whatsoever at that peaceful demonstration.

I remember 1960. At that time, it was the race between Senator John Kennedy and Vice President Richard Nixon. It was very, very close. Everyone was on pins and needles, but there was an orderly transfer. Richard Nixon conceded, and to take this out further, he did a peaceful and orderly transfer, and away he went.

Then you had Al Gore—Senator Al Gore at that time, former Vice President Al Gore—and George W. Bush in 2000. We know how that turned out with the chads and all the hanging chads and the consternation of not knowing for so long. Then, basically, for the sake of our country, he did the right thing. Again, we expect that to be done.

We are in the most difficult times right now, and for the President to even address the subject of maybe not knowing if he would accept or not is beyond all of our comprehension that could ever happen in America, that it could ever happen in the discourse and the will of the voters, the verification of the votes and being able to protect the ballot box. We have come too long in our country, and we continue to be challenged.

I believe that to have the leader of the free world talk as if we are an autocracy—authoritarian versus a democracy—is something that alarmed me, along with colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Even as quiet as some may be, I know they are alarmed with that.

What we did is affirm who we are in the Senate and what we believe in. The resolution is very clear. All it says is that we affirm as the Senate our "commitment to the orderly and peaceful transfer of power called for in the Constitution of the United States" and intend that there should be no disruptions by the President or any person in power to overturn the will of the people of the United States. It is really who we are.

Mr. President, it is what you defended, what you fought for, why you entered the service. I am so proud of all the people who have served. Thank you for your service, Mr. President.

Thank you to all the people in West Virginia, the most patriotic people in the world. I have said this many times. I am so proud of my State. We have more veterans per capita than most any State; shed more blood, lost more lives for the cause of freedom than most any State. We never failed to answer the call. We have done the heavy lifting. Our people worked hard, includ-

ing my grandfather and all my relatives. We mined the coal that made the steel that built the guns and ships and the factories and defended our country and our great Nation. We are very proud of all that.

This is not who we are. This is not who we are, and we must speak loudly. This is not politics. This is not Republican or Democrat—make no mistake. This is basically saying that if you believe—for the sake of the Good Lord and all we believe in and our country, this is about maintaining this democracy. That is all this is about—maintaining. We will defend that.

Today, we have just reaffirmed our commitment to the orderly transition of power by the President of the United States, whoever that should be, whenever that might happen; that they must have an orderly transfer that we all will defend and uphold. That is what we affirmed today.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity, and I thank all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Thank you for standing true for who we are and what we believe in and what we have committed ourselves to.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING JUSTICE RUTH BADER GINSBURG

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I want to rise just briefly to pay tribute to Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

I saw a statement about her in the aftermath of her passing that said she will probably go down in history as one of the greatest women lawyers in the history of the United States. I don't think that does her justice. I want to take the floor to say that Ruth Bader Ginsburg, in my view, will probably go down in history as one of the top three judges and lawyers ever in the history of the United States, male or female. I want to describe why. Before I do, I just want to notice the outpouring of support for her.

In the 4 days after she passed, from Friday night until Tuesday night, my office received 37,000 pieces of correspondence about Justice Ginsburg, praising her, lifting her up as a role model, expressing concern about what the Court would be without her. In my 8 years in the Senate, I have never seen an outpouring of support for an individual like that. That is just an example of how highly we hold her in regard.

Justice Ginsburg is well known and particularly well known in Virginia. One of the opinions she authored that is one of her real pivotal opinions was an opinion that ruled that a public university—the Virginia Military Institute—could not deny access to women

students. That was a very controversial case in Virginia. Justice Ginsburg's opinion was courteous and recognized the great virtue of VMI as an institution but held up its many virtues and values and said women students at this public university should be able to have the same access.

Justice Ginsburg as a Justice has left her mark on our society in such an amazing way.

I want to talk about Ruth Bader Ginsburg the lawyer because I assert that if Ruth Bader Ginsburg had never been on the Supreme Court, she still would have earned her way into one of the greatest American lawyers or jurists of all time. Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

It was a Virginian who wrote into the Declaration of Independence the words that are maybe among some of the most known words in the English language: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal." Those words are so powerful. They set out a powerful North Star for our country in equality and principle but had ambiguity wrapped up in them.

Jefferson, although he believed in equality, knew and was deeply troubled by the fact that slaves and other even freed African Americans at the time were not treated equally. Jefferson wasn't particularly troubled by the fact that women were not treated equally at that time. He had an ability to see what the principle should be but not necessarily to apply it to his own life, which is, frankly, a weakness that I think we all have suffered from during our life at times, but at least he set out the right principle and said that it applied to men.

I think you can look at the history of our country as a North Star was set for us in 1776, and over time, we sort of progressively realized, wow, that is what equality means. We have to orient closer to the star. A sailor can steer by a star without ever reaching it, and maybe, because we are imperfect people, we can orient by the star of equality and never get fully there because we are imperfect. When we orient by it, we do pretty well.

In the aftermath of the Civil War, the Constitution was dramatically rewritten with the addition of the 13th Amendment, banning slavery; the 14th Amendment, creating due process and equal protection of the laws; and the 15th Amendment, blocking limitations of voting based on race.

I want to talk for a minute the 14th Amendment. The 14th Amendment might be the longest amendment in the Constitution. It is power-packed.

Every citizen is entitled to the privileges and immunities of citizenship. No one can be "deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law," but especially—that echoing of what Jefferson said—all persons are entitled to the "equal protection of the laws."

The 14th Amendment is interesting because in other parts of the amendment, it talks about what you get if you are a citizen, but on the equal pro-

tection side, you don't have to be a citizen. All persons are entitled to "equal protection of the laws."

When that was passed by Congress and ratified by States in 1870, the Constitution fundamentally changed. One of the fascinating things is, as soon as the Constitution had this 14th Amendment with this particular clause in it guaranteeing equal protection of the laws—let me tell you about one of the first cases that came to the Supreme Court.

A woman by the name of Myra Bradwell, living in Illinois, wanted to be licensed to practice law. She wanted to be a lawyer, just like Ruth Bader Ginsburg. Illinois would not allow her to practice law because she was a woman. She said: Wait a minute. We have a 14th Amendment, and it guarantees me the privileges and immunities of being a U.S. citizen, guarantees me equal protection of the laws.

She took her case all the way up to the U.S. Supreme Court after Illinois denied her a law license. In 1871, 1 year after the Constitution had been amended to guarantee the equality of every person, by an 8-to-1 decision, the Supreme Court ruled that Myra Bradwell could not practice law and Illinois could limit law practice to men if that is what they chose.

Let me read from that opinion. Justice Bradley wrote an opinion then on the Court. Here is what he said:

The natural and proper timidity and delicacy which belongs to the female sex evidently unfits it for many of the occupations of civil life. . . . The paramount destiny and mission of women are to fulfill the noble and benign offices of wife and mother. This is the law of the Creator.

By an 8-to-1 decision, the U.S. Supreme Court, on which Ruth Bader Ginsburg would later sit after a distinguished career as an attorney, said that Illinois could deprive women of the ability to practice the profession of lawyer.

When did the Supreme Court change that ruling? It is still kind of shocking to me that it was not until 1971—100 years later, in a case called *Reed v. Reed*, a case that came out of the State court system in Idaho—that Chief Justice Warren Burger, for a unanimous Court, said: Wait a minute. The 14th Amendment says all persons are entitled to the equal protection of the laws. Guess what. That applies to women.

How the Court in 1871 could have read those words and said it didn't apply to women is kind of hard to imagine, but it should make us humble because it should suggest that even educated, smart people could get things wrong.

Yet, 100 years later, in 1971, there was *Reed v. Reed*, which was a technical, quirky case about Idaho law that preferred men over women to be executors of estates so that, if there were two with equal claims in terms of being a relation of somebody who died intestate, they would prefer a man over a woman. That was a quirky, technical

case that came to the Supreme Court. After 101 years, following the passage of the 14th Amendment, the Supreme Court said: Wait a minute. Women are citizens. Women are people. Women are entitled to equality.

Who wrote the brief in that case?

The brief in that case was written by a talented, young lawyer who had been one of nine in her class at Harvard Law School, who had often been told she couldn't do this or she couldn't do that, and who hadn't often been offered jobs along the way. The brief in that case was written by Ruth Bader Ginsburg. In very, very characteristic humility, she was the brains behind the case, but she allowed the case to be argued in the Supreme Court by the Idaho attorney who was very close to Mrs. Reed, who was pursuing the appeal in the Supreme Court.

When *Reed v. Reed* was decided, it was an earthquake. After 100 years, to finally say that, of course, women are equal, and, of course, women can make claims under the 14th Amendment, it was an earthquake, and it affected all aspects of American law.

Immediately after *Reed v. Reed*, Congress went through the entire United States Code. There were dozens—possibly hundreds—of distinctions in the code that gave preference to men over women or made some distinction between men and women. Yet, after *Reed v. Reed*, Congress scrubbed the laws of this country to eliminate second-class status for women, at least in law. We haven't completely gotten there but maybe in practice.

The State legislatures of all 50 States also did the same. There were all kinds of quirky and archaic rules that held women back in property and in civil matters—laws that, for example, said that a married woman, because of being married, couldn't prosecute a rape charge against her husband or that it was a defense to rape if the man married the woman—that this could be a complete defense and could wipe out criminal offenses.

All of these weird distinctions in law that had been allowed since the beginning of our country, even with a Constitution that guaranteed women's equality, were suddenly under the microscope with a new way of looking at our society, and it changed because of this tiny giant, Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

That is the only point that I really want to make today on the floor. As a Justice, Ruth Bader Ginsburg changed our country and had a big impact in Virginia in the decision about the Virginia Military Institute. That decision was about one institution, but it became a decision that applied to all institutions—that public educational institutions cannot deprive women of equal access to the educational experience.

I will just conclude where I started.

If Ruth Bader Ginsburg had never been a Supreme Court Justice, the work that she had done as an architect of helping the American legal system

but also the American citizens understand that equal protection of the laws applies to women just like they apply to men would have entitled her to have been viewed as one of the most impactful lawyers of all time.

I would put her up with John Marshall, the first great Chief Justice of the Court, who really had to form so many of the doctrines that we now sort of take for granted about our American jurisprudence, and Thurgood Marshall, who, in many ways, carried the same fight for equality to make us realize that it applied to people regardless of the color of their skin and then served on the Supreme Court. They are the two lawyers of whom I think when I think of Ruth Bader Ginsburg, and I am not sure that anyone else is in the same class with her other than those two.

It is a sad time when someone of such magnitude passes, but I can tell from the 37,000 pieces of correspondence that my office received in the first 4 days after she left that, if you measure a life not by the day that it ends but by the influence that it has and the example that it sets, it is also a time in which we can just admire, be in awe of, and celebrate the accomplishments of a wonderful American.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, last Friday, as the Jewish New Year began, Rosh Hashanah, our Nation lost a titan of justice and an unmatched force for good—Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

According to Jewish tradition, a person who dies on Rosh Hashanah is a *tzaddik*—a person of great righteousness. Justice Ginsburg, who was only the seventh Jewish Supreme Court Justice and the first female Jewish Justice, was, indeed, righteous.

I and Jill, my wife, were proud to call Ruth a friend, and like all Santa Feans, we are proud that Ruth graced our city at the Santa Fe Opera every summer. She loved New Mexico, and New Mexico loved her. Our hearts are with Justice Ginsburg's family.

You shared a great national treasure with all of us, and we are eternally grateful.

Ruth Bader Ginsburg was 1 of only 12 women who graduated from Columbia Law School in 1959. With a young child in tow, she tied for first in her class. Talk about a trailblazer. Indeed, RBG, as she is so affectionately called, blazed so many trails—too many to list. She was the first woman to serve on two major law reviews and one of the first female law professors in the Nation. She cofounded the first law journal on women's rights, and coau-

thored the first casebook on gender discrimination.

Ruth Bader Ginsburg had to push open those doors because no one opened them for her. She was no stranger to gender discrimination. She was demoted at work when she became pregnant with her first child. She was refused a U.S. Supreme Court clerkship because she was a woman. She was also paid less than her male counterparts as a law professor.

Always driven toward justice, RBG became the leading legal mind behind incrementally dismantling gender discrimination laws in the United States. She spearheaded the strategy to apply the 14th Amendment—requiring equal protection under the law—to women, and she won in the Supreme Court five times. Her victories helped to take down the mass of legal structures relegating women to second-class status. She accomplished what was nearly impossible and expanded who is included in “We the People,” and her quest for justice never ended.

As a jurist, she authored groundbreaking opinions—striking down strict requirements on abortion clinics that were designed to put them out of business, establishing the right of persons with mental illness to be treated in the community instead of in institutions, and opening up the Virginia Military Institute to female cadets, which, I think, Senator KAINE talked about a little bit earlier.

She was also as well known for her forceful dissents. “I dissent” has become a rallying cry against an activist conservative Court.

In 2013, when the Court struck down the preclearance provisions of the Voting Rights Act, Justice Ginsburg declared: “‘Hubris’ is a fit word for today’s demolition of the VRA.” She observed that striking down voting protections because they worked too well was like “throwing away your umbrella in a rainstorm because you are not getting wet.”

Justice Ginsburg was brilliant, determined, and courageous.

Now, as her long and well-lived life has come to an end and as the Nation mourns, it is only fitting that she continue making firsts—as the first woman to lie in state in the Capitol. All of us—women and men alike—owe a debt of gratitude to Justice Ginsburg and to her righteous and unwavering commitment to justice and equality under the law.

As you have now heard many times, Justice Ginsburg’s last words to the American public were “My most fervent wish is that I will not be replaced until a new president is installed.”

Yet, mere hours after the Supreme Court announced Justice Ginsburg’s passing, while the Nation was in mourning, Leader MCCONNELL announced he would replace her before the current Presidency ends.

Let me say this: While my heart is broken, my soul is on fire.

Not only are Senate Republicans dis-

quest, they are turning their back on the principle that they claimed was pure just 4 years ago.

In February 2016, Justice Scalia passed away a full 9 months before a Presidential election. At that time, the majority leader refused to hold hearings on President Obama’s highly qualified nominee, proclaiming:

The American people should have a voice in the selection of their next Supreme Court Justice. Therefore, this vacancy should not be filled until we have a new president.

Those words meant nothing. They were deceitful tricks in pursuit of raw power, and they have brought shame upon this body.

Election day is only 40 days away, but it is more accurate to say that the election ends in 40 days, because the election is actually underway today. Voters are already voting in 29 States. More than half of the States are voting. Tens of millions of Americans will cast their votes before election day. The leader’s vow to vote to replace Justice Ginsburg is a slap in the face to these voters and runs roughshod over the Constitution.

Senator MCCONNELL is moving at lightning speed to steal the second Supreme Court seat because he knows this President faces an uncertain electoral future. He is scared to let the American people, as he put it, “have a voice in the selection of their next Supreme Court Justice.”

This hypocrisy is only outmatched by the utter disdain for American voters—disdain for their intelligence, disdain for their will.

But the real scandal will be what this means to the American people. On November 10, 7 days after election day, the Supreme Court will hear argument on the legality of the Affordable Care Act, or what many call the ACA. After failing to repeal the ACA in Congress, now the Republicans are trying to destroy it in the courts, and they are rushing to fill this vacancy with a judge who will do that work for them.

The Trump administration is standing with 20 Republican Governors and attorneys general who are asking the Supreme Court to strike down the ACA. Republicans are trying to take away Americans’ healthcare in the middle of the worst pandemic in a century. It is unforgivable.

By overwhelming numbers, the American people support the ACA. Before the ACA, insurance companies could deny healthcare insurance to people with preexisting conditions. Up to 129 million Americans under age 65 have preexisting conditions. The millions of people who have been infected by COVID-19 now have a preexisting condition for the rest of their lives. In my home State of New Mexico, more than 840,000 people live with a preexisting condition. Because of the ACA, 23 million more Americans have healthcare insurance, and millions more have Medicaid expansion. This includes hundreds of thousands of New Mexicans.

When the ACA was challenged years ago, the Supreme Court upheld it by a 5-to-4 vote. We are one vote away from the decimation of our healthcare rights at a time when nearly 7 million Americans have contracted COVID-19.

The threat is not only to the ACA but also to women's reproductive healthcare, our environmental protections, and what is left of our campaign finance limits. So we know why they are moving at a record pace to fill this seat.

But while the President and the majority leader want to rush through a lifetime Justice in just a few weeks, COVID relief has languished on Senator MCCONNELL's desk for months. Millions of Americans are out of work. Small businesses are closing their doors. Schools can't reopen safely. Parents are burning the candle at both ends, working and caring for kids at home. State, local, and Tribal governments can't meet budgets for essential services.

The American people desperately need another relief package, but the Senate Republicans and the President don't think there is any urgency. Leader MCCONNELL said that himself.

According to the President, COVID-19 "affects virtually nobody." The President said that—"affects virtually nobody."

This virus that "affects virtually nobody" is the third leading cause of death in the United States, has taken more lives in 8 short months than the Vietnam and Middle East wars combined, and has sent our economy into a nosedive not seen since the Great Depression.

We talk a lot about priorities here in the Senate. Right now you are seeing Senate Republican priorities in stark relief. They will rush a lifetime Supreme Court pick in weeks—violating every principle they established themselves—to please their far-right donors. But they will neglect relief for you—for struggling families, for people out of work, for people sick and dying—for months.

Finally, we cannot ignore the fact that the President has explicitly said he wants to fill this vacancy to help decide the 2020 election in his favor. He has repeatedly lied that absentee ballots, votes from Democratic areas, or votes that are tabulated after election day are somehow fraudulent.

And like an authoritarian, he does not even try to correct himself when his lies are debunked. Instead, he openly admits he wants the Supreme Court to decide the election by disqualifying votes he does not like and even refuses to commit to a peaceful transfer of power.

The Senate should not become an accomplice to this corrupt scheme that threatens the future of our democracy, and every Senate Republican should condemn the President's refusal to commit to give up power peacefully.

I would note that several of my Republican friends have stood up and

have said that there should be a peaceful transition of power, and I applaud them for that.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—MOTIONS TO RECONSIDER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the nominations confirmed this week, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

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

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of proceedings be approved to date.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

RECOGNIZING GOLD SHAW FARM

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, agriculture has always been at the heart of Vermont's economy. For generations, families across Vermont have made a living through agriculture, tilling our rocky soil and raising livestock on our hillsides. Farming in Vermont has always been a challenging yet very rewarding way of life. Now more than ever, it is clear to see the obstacles faced by farmers. I would like to take a moment to recognize Gold Shaw Farm, a farm founded by a husband and wife team in northeastern Vermont. Morgan and Allison Gold, the owners of Gold Shaw Farm, have found a very interesting way to meet these challenges, supplement their agricultural income, adapt their practices, and share their work with the world.

Morgan and Allison Gold moved to Peacham, VT, and established their farm in 2016. On their 150-acre plot, the Golds raise chickens, geese, ducks, and sheep and cultivate a variety of vegetables and berries. Soon after they started farming, the Golds began filming their daily activities and posting them on YouTube. The farm may be small, but over the years, Gold Shaw Farm has amassed a very large and loyal fan base that tune in regularly to watch as Morgan and Allison collect eggs, chase ducks, and play with their dog, Toby.

Some of the farm's fans have even driven all the way to Peacham to buy eggs and visit the farm. With the help of their growing audience, the Golds hope to expand their farm into a larger sustainable operation. Starting and maintaining a farm is challenging work, but in the Golds' model, we see innovative and creative ways to not only document farming experiences, but share those experiences with the world and hopefully inspire a new generation of farmers. I look forward to tuning in to watch their progress.

Earlier this year, the Golds were profiled in *The New York Times*, and I ask unanimous consent that the article, "In a Wistful Age, Farmers Find a New Angle: Chores" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the *New York Times*, Aug. 7, 2020]

IN A WISTFUL AGE, FARMERS FIND A NEW ANGLE: CHORES

(By Ellen Barry)

PEACHAM, VT.—The sweet smell of hay rose off the earth on a recent evening, as Morgan Gold strode across his farmyard in heavy boots. He crossed the paddock, scanning for new eggs, water levels, infected peck wounds, rips in the fence line.

But mainly—let's be honest—he was looking for content.

Though Mr. Gold sells poultry and eggs from his duck farm in Vermont's northeast corner, most of what he produces as a farmer is, well, entertainment.

Mr. Gold, who is short and stocky, with the good-natured ease of a standup comedian, does his chores while carrying a digital camera in one hand and murmuring into a microphone.

Then, twice a week, like clockwork, he posts a short video on YouTube about his exploits as a neophyte farmer, often highlighting failures or pratfalls. Keeping a close eye on analytics, he has boosted his YouTube audiences high enough to provide a steady advertising revenue of around \$2,500 to \$4,000 a month, about eight times what he earns from selling farm products.

This part of New England is rocky, hilly and isolated, and generations of small farmers have cast about for new ways to scrape out a living: the sleigh rides, the alpacas, the therapy ponies, the pick-your-own hemp. It is a new thing, though, to make farm life into reality TV.

Mr. Gold, 40, has learned the hard way—he tried to take a month off last winter—that any gap in his YouTube publication schedule results in a steep drop-off in audience. So he keeps a running list of themes that could be fodder for future videos. It reads, in part:

Should I Feed My Dog Eggs?

Don't Trust This Duck

My Homestead Is a Dumpster Fire

What Does My Guard Dog Do All Day?

He has learned, through trial and error, what works with an audience. The sheepdog-mounted GoPro didn't work. ("People were like, 10 seconds and I was puking," said his wife, Allison Ebrahimi Gold.) Slow, sumptuous drone footage of his sun-dappled 150 acres, land porn for wistful cubicle dwellers—that definitely works.

Character development works, as demonstrated by Mr. Gold's most popular video, "Our Freakishly Huge Duck (This Is Not NORMAL)," which, as he would put it, blew the doors off. Slow-motion footage of wagging goose butts, set to a bouncy, whimsical orchestral soundtrack, works.