that affects all 50 States. Our two parties used to agree on the need to reliably invest in infrastructure. We should be able to do that again. President Biden is hosting bipartisan discussions about his proposal at the White House today and will continue to bring lawmakers and stakeholders together to find common ground. I know that the administration is going to talk to Members from both sides of the aisle to incorporate their ideas.

Every day now, millions of Americans are getting the vaccine—4 million on 1 day over the weekend—and we are closer than ever to defeating the COVID–19 pandemic. The worst of COVID–19 is, hopefully, in the rear view mirror. The streets of New York City, this weekend as I wandered about, were more alive than I have seen them in months. Soon we will have an opportunity to work together to strengthen our recovery and create the jobs of the future. A big, bold investment in our Nation's infrastructure is just the way to do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

PERMITTING THE REMAINS OF THE LATE UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE OFFICER WILLIAM F. EVANS TO LIE IN HONOR IN THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 27, which was received today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con Res. 27) permitting the remains of the late United States Capitol Police Officer William F. Evans to lie in honor in the rotunda of the Capitol.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion 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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) was agreed to.

DIRECTING THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL TO TRANSFER THE CATAFALQUE SITUATED IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER TO THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL FOR USE IN CONNECTION WITH SERVICES CONDUCTED FOR UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE OFFICER WILLIAM F. EVANS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 28, which was received today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 28) directing the Architect of the Capitol to transfer the catafalque situated in the Capitol Visitor Center to the rotunda of the Capitol for use in connection with services conducted for United States Capitol Police Officer William F. Evans.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion 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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 28) was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I have one short issue and another issue of about 10 minutes.

Over the Easter break, I held a Q&A in 24 counties to hear what was on the minds of Iowans. It was my constituents' agenda, not my agenda, that we discussed. From my cattle market transparency bill to Second Amendment issues, COVID–19 vaccines, and the crisis at the southern border, Iowans are always up to date on the issues most important to them.

One prominent question: Why can't you guys in the Senate get along? In other words, ''Why not more bipartisanship?'' is a constant question I get.

Iowans want Congress to work in a bipartisan way to enhance our Nation's infrastructure through increased funding for roads, bridges, highways, waterways, and rural broadband, among many other infrastructure issues.

Unfortunately, what I have heard so far about President Biden's plan is that it is everything but the kitchen sink and not enough focus on just the big, big issue and the long-term issue of infrastructure.

Iowans expect us to work in a bipartisan way, and I hope Democrats will agree to work together with us, unlike the passage of the $1.9 trillion bill.

SECTION 230 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT

I recently spoke on the Senate floor about the important issue of free speech. Today, I would like to speak on the power of Big Tech to censor free speech.

It has been 25 years since section 230 of the Communications Act was signed into law. This law grants wide-sweeping immunity to interactive computer services that host third-party content.

The goal of section 230 at the time was laudable. The internet was in its infancy, and content being posted to message boards by third parties was leading to litigation that threatened the spread of free speech and expression. Section 230 was enacted to encourage free speech, while giving companies the ability to remove illegal and obscene materials.

Section 230 and the legal shield it offers helped to enable the internet to grow into what we know this very day. However, interactive computer services are no longer struggling companies but some of the largest corporations in the world today. Would you believe that when section 230 was signed into law, the words ''Google,'' ''Facebook,'' ''Twitter,'' and ''YouTube'' did not even exist as words or companies? Today, they are giant, dominant tech companies.

Many argue that these private companies have their own terms of service and are able to enforce them as they wish and also that they are not covered under the First Amendment. Yet, these platforms are now the new public square, where it is important that all voices and viewpoints are able to be heard.

With the immunities that these companies have and the importance of dialogue on their platforms, arguably they are in effect state actors, and therefore First Amendment protections should apply to user-generated content.

The size and power of these companies also contribute to their ability to censor speech and undermine the First Amendment. Google controls 87 percent of search, Facebook has 2.8 billion monthly active users, 500 million tweets are sent on Twitter each day, and over 1 billion hours of videos are watched on YouTube every day.

When a campaign has monopoly power, it no longer is constrained by normal market forces. If these platforms had competitors, consumers could choose alternatives when they disagree with the terms of service or moderation policies. However, right now, the only choice consumers have is to take it or leave it.

Section 230 appears to compound this problem. Big Tech has no competitors and is immune from liability. These companies are unaccountable to their customers, the courts, and the government. If not for their monopoly power and section 230 immunity, these companies might not be involved in the actions and the censorship we see today. These platforms are where people communicate online, and there are no real alternatives.

This innovation has democratized our political system. I think that is good. Yet, there are people who don't like that every person is able to get their views out, and they want to interfere with and censor those views. We cannot stand for this cancel culture and the interference with free speech.