

But few things compel audiences, he came to realize, more than a real-life setback. He came to this realization last summer when a mink broke into his duck hutch, leaving its interior spattered with eggs and blood and feathers.

“It was one of the most depressing days of my life,” he said, adding, “but at the same time, I’m thinking, ‘How is the audience going to react to this sort of thing?’”

The next videos, which featured freaky night-vision footage of the offending mink, helped boost Mr. Gold’s YouTube audience toward the 100,000-viewer threshold. And it helped him understand his own place in the universe of farmer-influencers, which tilts heavily toward the how-to genre.

“The storytelling part is what I’m good at,” he said. “I’m not that good at the farming part.” It is a paradox that the less financially viable small farming becomes, the more that Americans want to experience it firsthand.

This idea is as old as the dude ranch; video streaming of farm life is only the most recent iteration. Amy Fewell, the founder of Homesteaders of America, said the number of farmers who earn substantial income off YouTube channels is steadily climbing, and now stands at around 50. Some of them earn money through product endorsement deals, like Al Lumnah, who posts videos five days a week from his farm in Littleton, N.H.

It’s a lot of work: Mr. Lumnah wakes up at 3:30 a.m. so he can edit the previous day’s footage in time to post new video at 6 a.m., which his 210,000 regular viewers, who are scattered as far as Cambodia and India, have come to expect. “People will say, it’s lunchtime here in Ukraine,” Mr. Lumnah said.

Others, like Justin Rhodes, a farmer in North Carolina, have parlayed a giant YouTube audience into a dues-paying membership enterprise—he has 2,000 fans who pay annual fees of up to \$249 for private instruction and direct communication, via text message. “We don’t sell a single farm product,” Mr. Rhodes said. “Our farm product is education and entertainment.”

Mr. Gold, who moved to Vermont and started his YouTube channel four years ago, has not reached that point. He still has a full-time job, as a marketing executive for an insurance company, and so far has refused the endorsement deals. He has built up his flocks of chicken, geese and ducks to 100, and is hoping to add cows next spring.

He’s certainly captured the interest of the farmers who surround him in Peacham, said Tom Galinat, a neighbor whose family farms 550 acres.

Farmers here struggle to eke out a living from a rocky, uneven soil and hostile climate, and they are astounded—in some cases a little jealous—to discover that Mr. Gold is internet famous, he said.

“He’s found a way to monetize farming with less physical labor,” Mr. Galinat said. “Some guys are like, this is silly, since he’s farming 20 ducks. But at the same time, he’s making more than other farmers who have 500 acres of land.”

But Mr. Galinat, who is also Peacham’s town clerk, counts himself among a younger generation of farmers who are learning from Mr. Gold.

“He has taught me I am no longer selling hay, I am selling a lifestyle,” he said. “He’s really selling himself—his emotions, his opinions, his downfalls, his successes. Boom! That’s it, that’s the way forward.”

As Mr. Gold’s audience has grown, he has at times been taken aback by the enthusiasm.

Several dozen viewers have driven all the way to Peacham and knocked on his door, hoping to buy eggs or talk about ducks, something his wife described as “really distressing.” “Morgan is so vulnerable on film,” she said, “that people assume they know us as people.”

Most of it is nice, though. Viewers send handcrafted accessories for his outbuildings, like a plaque that says, in elaborate lettering, “Ye Olde Quack House.” When one of the Golds’ barn cats was hit by a car recently, at least 50 viewers offered cash to cover her medical bills.

Samier Elrasoul, a nursing student in Howell, Mich., is so devoted to Mr. Gold’s videos that he got a vanity license plate reading QUACKN, in honor of the catchphrase—“Release the Quacken!”—that Mr. Gold exclaims when he frees his ducks from their hutch in the morning.

Mr. Elrasoul, 34, says the videos inspire him because he, too, has a dead-end job—he works as a supervisor at Starbucks—and he, too, harbors a dream of changing his life.

“Seeing some guy just like me, just dropping everything and doing what he’s passionate about, was very encouraging to see,” he said. “I’m like, wow, he’s living his dream.”

For others, Mr. Gold’s farm has provided a haven in a difficult time. Charlotte Schmoll, who is 6 and lives in Portland, Ore., spent days at the beginning of lockdown watching Mr. Gold’s videos over and over. She announced last month that she, too, plans to raise ducks in Vermont.

“One of the questions that comes up when we watch shows is, ‘Is this real? Did this happen?’” said her mother, Julie Schmoll. “That’s one of the things she liked about Mr. Rogers, and maybe she likes about the duck farmer, that he is also quote-unquote true, or real.”

Mr. Gold does wonder, sometimes, about what it means, in the long term, to make his life into a story. When the cat was hit by a car, he found himself reflexively converting the event into a script, and stopped to ask himself who he was becoming.

“It’s like, how much is the experience and how much is the packaging of the experience, and how do you distinguish between the two,” he said. “Because you almost go, ‘I had a duck die, let me think about the first act here, and the second act.’”

And still, the show goes on. Late on a recent evening, Mr. Gold was putting finishing touches on a video about his dog, Toby, who has never quite grown into his intended role as a duck herder.

Early drafts of the video had focused on how much the dog had improved.

But there was something dishonest about that, Mr. Gold realized that evening, as he and Ms. Gold flung themselves around the paddock, trying to catch birds with string nets, while the dog looked on placidly, thumping his tail.

Now, in the gathering dark, Mr. Gold was rewriting the ending to one that emphasized his acceptance of the dog’s true nature.

It’s always difficult to bring closure to a video, Ms. Gold said. It was almost 9 o’clock, and she was hoping to go inside.

“You have to create an end,” she said. “Because the truth is, we do this every day, so there’s not really an end.”

But Mr. Gold, for his part, was pleased.

“I love it when a story has a good moral,” he said.

BUDGET ENFORCEMENT LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, BBEDCA, establishes statutory limits on discretionary spending and allows for various adjustments to those limits. In addition, sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 allow the Chairman of the Budget Committee to establish and make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments.

The Senate will soon consider H.R. 8337, the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2021 and Other Extensions Act. This measure includes two provisions, found in sections 126 and 163, that are designated as being for emergency purposes pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of BBEDCA. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that these provisions will have no net effect on budget authority but would result in \$92 million in outlays in fiscal year 2021.

As a result of the emergency designations, I am revising the outlay allocation to the Committee on Appropriations by \$92 million in fiscal year 2021. Further, I am increasing the budgetary outlay aggregate for fiscal year 2021 by equivalent amounts.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables, which provide details about the adjustment, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REVISION TO BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

(Pursuant to Sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974—\$ Millions)

		2021
Current Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,832,200	
Outlays	4,008,705	
Adjustments:		
Budget Authority	0	
Outlays	92	
Revised Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,832,200	
Outlays	4,008,797	

REVISION TO SPENDING ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021

(Pursuant to Sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974—\$ Millions)

		2021
Current Allocation:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	671,500	
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	626,500	
General Purpose Outlays	1,584,277	
Adjustments:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	0	
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	0	
General Purpose Outlays	92	
Revised Allocation:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	671,500	
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	626,500	
General Purpose Outlays	1,584,369	

Memorandum: Detail of Adjustments Made Above

	OCC	Program Integrity	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Wildfire Suppression	U.S. Census	Total
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
General Purpose Outlays	0	0	0	92	0	0	92

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the junior Senator from Nevada, regarding sections 2861 and 2862 of title XXVIII of the National Defense Authorization Act that was recently considered by the Senate. These two sections of the bill include complex, intertwined history of public lands, Nevada's cultures and economy, Native American Tribes, and the Silver State's proud role in hosting and training our men and women in uniform.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Nevada for joining me today for this colloquy. The Senator correctly notes that these two sections of the National Defense Authorization Act raise profound historical public policy questions about how to protect our public lands, recognize the voices and issues raised by Native American Tribes, local governments and concerned citizens, and maintain Nevada's proud role in support of our Nation's Armed Forces and our national security. These public policy questions are amongst the most consequential natural resource issues facing the Silver State and have prompted Nevadans from every corner of our State to engage on the best path forward.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I thank the junior Senator from Nevada for her partnership on these important questions. This year's annual defense authorization bill is more than 1,000 pages long, but sections 2861 and 2862 together take up less than one page. As the Senator knows, while the legislative text seems quite simple, significant and historical public policy questions underpin these two sections of the bill.

Section 2861 provides for a 20-year extension of the public land withdrawals specific to Fallon Range Training Complex which is utilized by the U.S. Navy. Section 2862 provides for a similar 20-year extension of the public land withdrawals specific to the Nevada Test and Training Range, otherwise known as NTTR, which is utilized by the U.S. Air Force. The reality of what this legislation means to our constituents in Nevada, our Nation's public lands, and its potential impact for current and future generations is far more complex. Given the importance of the public lands, Native American Tribes, Nevada's culture and economy, and our Nation's military, can the junior Senator from Nevada provide more detail on that history with respect to NTTR?

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, to best answer the Senator's question, it is important to start with the history of the Desert National Wildlife Refuge. The

establishment of the Desert National Wildlife Refuge predates the Nevada Test and Training Range and was created by President Franklin Roosevelt on May 20, 1936, via Executive Order 7373.

FDR created the Desert Game Range, as it was known then, to provide habitat and protection for desert bighorn sheep, Nevada's State animal. Originally the Range totaled more than 2.25 million acres, including lands both north and south of U.S. Highway 95.

We know even more today about the value of this area. The Desert National Wildlife Refuge contains six mountain ranges and seven distinct life zones, with elevations ranging from 2,200 feet to nearly 10,000 feet. The variations in elevation and rainfall have created diverse habitats, necessary for its hundreds of species of native flora and fauna to live and flourish. There are currently two species listed as endangered or threatened: notably the Pahrump Poolfish and the Desert Tortoise. This area was under the joint administration of the Bureau of Fisheries, the predecessor to the Fish and Wildlife Service—USFWS—which was not created until 1940, and the Bureau of Land Management—BLM.

Today, the Desert National Wildlife Refuge is the largest wildlife refuge outside Alaska. The Refuge has gone through various legislative boundary adjustments and currently encompasses 1.615 million acres of the Mojave Desert. Public Land Order 4079, issued on August 26, 1966, and corrected on September 23, 1966, revoked EO 7373. This PLO changed the name to the Desert National Wildlife Range, reduced its size to 1.588 million acres, and transferred sole administration to the USFWS. Lands withdrawn in PLO 4079 were set aside specifically for the protection, enhancement, and maintenance of wildlife resources, including bighorn sheep. Then, in 1974, as part of a Wilderness review required by the Wilderness Act of 1964, 1.3 million acres of the Desert National Wildlife Refuge were proposed as Wilderness by USFWS. This history is important, but these lands also remain central to Native American Tribes in Nevada.

Could the senior Senator from Nevada expand upon their importance?

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I thank the junior Senator for her question and would begin by noting that the mountains of southern Nevada are sacred lands, where Native Americans carved their stories onto its mountains and cliffs and left artifacts which detail how they lived and thrived. The bighorn sheep which are central to this area are sacred to Nevada's Native American Tribes, including the Moapa Band of Paiutes, who

are among the most acutely impacted by these public policy questions raised by Senator ROSEN. The creation story told by the Moapa Band of Paiutes include references to bighorn sheep, and the Las Vegas Paiutes also regard the Desert National Wildlife Refuge as culturally significant. With the history of the Refuge properly established, can my colleague, a former member of the House Armed Services Committee, help provide history on NTTR?

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, the history of NTTR begins in the 1940s when it was known as the Las Vegas Bombing and Gunnery Range, later changed to the Nellis Air Force Range in October 1987, and finally to NTTR in August 2003.

The NTTR is a military training area consisting of approximately 2.9 million acres of Federal land used by the U.S. Air Force Warfare Center at Nellis Air Force Base in southern Nevada. The NTTR includes a “simulated Integrated Air Defense System” and several individual ranges with 12,000 targets. The NTTR area has been used for aerial gunnery and bombing, nuclear tests, as a proving ground and flight test area, and for aircraft control and warning exercises.

These 2.9 million acres have been withdrawn from public use and reserved for military use, including the approximately 842,254 acres of the Desert National Wildlife Refuge land that overlaps with the NTTR. The legislative history surrounding this history begins in 1940, with Executive Order 8578 giving the military joint administration with USFWS of the western half of the Desert National Wildlife Refuge, for war purposes and restricting public access. The NTTR land withdrawals were extended in 1962, with the issuance of PLO 2613, and in 1986, the withdrawals were extended for another 15 years with P.L. 99-606. Most recently, the withdrawals, were again extended through 2021, with P.L. 106-65 signed in 1999.

This law in 1999, included as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000—P.L. 106-65—transferred primary jurisdiction of 110,000 acres of bombing impact areas on the Desert National Wildlife Refuge from the USFWS to the Department of Defense. These lands were reserved for use by the Secretary of the Air Force as an armament and high hazard testing area; for training for aerial gunnery, rocketry, electronic warfare, and tactical maneuvering and air support; and for equipment and tactics development and testing.

More recently, in 2014, the House of Representatives considered legislation, H.R. 4253, which proposed repealing the existing withdrawals found in section