

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SASSE] proposes an amendment numbered 1577 to amendment No. 1578.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that additional unemployment benefits do not result in an individual receiving unemployment compensation that is more than the amount of wages the individual was earning prior to becoming unemployed.)

At the end of subtitle A of title II of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 2117. UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS MAY NOT EXCEED THE AMOUNT OF WAGES THE INDIVIDUAL WAS EARNING PRIOR TO BECOMING UNEMPLOYED.

(a) PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE.—Notwithstanding section 2101, in no case may the total amount of the weekly assistance applicable to an individual under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 2102 (including the increase under section 2104) exceed the amount of the individual's average weekly wages for an appropriate period prior to the receipt of assistance under such section, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

(b) FEDERAL PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—Notwithstanding section 2104, in no case may the sum of the weekly amount described in subparagraphs (A) (regular compensation) and (B) (Federal pandemic unemployment compensation) of section 2104(b)(1) for an individual exceed the amount of the individual's average weekly wages for which the amount described in such subparagraph (A) is based.

(c) PANDEMIC EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.—Notwithstanding section 2107, in no case may an individual's average weekly benefit amount described in 2107(b)(3) (including the increase under section 2104) exceed the amount of the average weekly wages for which the individual's average weekly benefit amount (determined without regard to such increase) is based.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Sasse amendment.

Mr. SASSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 79 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Alexander	Cotton	Hawley
Barrasso	Cramer	Hoeben
Blackburn	Crapo	Hyde-Smith
Blunt	Cruz	Inhofe
Boozman	Daines	Johnson
Braun	Enzi	Kennedy
Burr	Ernst	Lankford
Capito	Fischer	Loeffler
Cassidy	Graham	Manchin
Cornyn	Grassley	McConnell

McSally	Roberts	Shelby
Moran	Rounds	Sullivan
Murkowski	Rubio	Tillis
Perdue	Sasse	Toomey
Portman	Scott (FL)	Wicker
Risch	Scott (SC)	Young

NAYS—48

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Bennet	Harris	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hassan	Sanders
Booker	Heinrich	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Schumer
Cantwell	Jones	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaine	Sinema
Carper	King	Smith
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gardner	Peters	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Lee	Romney
Paul	Thune

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the 60-vote threshold having not been achieved, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1579) was rejected.

The amendment (No. 1578) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the third time.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 80 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Cruz	Klobuchar
Baldwin	Daines	Lankford
Barrasso	Duckworth	Leahy
Bennet	Durbin	Loeffler
Blackburn	Enzi	Manchin
Blumenthal	Ernst	Markey
Blunt	Feinstein	McConnell
Booker	Fischer	McSally
Boozman	Gardner	Menendez
Braun	Gillibrand	Merkley
Brown	Graham	Moran
Burr	Grassley	Murkowski
Cantwell	Harris	Murphy
Capito	Hassan	Murray
Cardin	Hawley	Perdue
Carper	Heinrich	Peters
Casey	Hirono	Portman
Cassidy	Hoeben	Reed
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Cooms	Inhofe	Roberts
Cornyn	Johnson	Rosen
Cortez Masto	Jones	Rounds
Cotton	Kaine	Rubio
Cramer	Kennedy	Sanders
Crapo	King	Sasse

Schatz	Smith	Van Hollen
Schumer	Stabenow	Warner
Scott (FL)	Sullivan	Warren
Scott (SC)	Tester	Whitehouse
Shaheen	Tillis	Wicker
Shelby	Toomey	Wyden
Sinema	Udall	Young

NOT VOTING—4

Lee	Romney
Paul	Thune

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). On this vote the yeas are 96, the nays are 0. The 60 vote threshold having been achieved, the bill is passed.

The bill (H.R. 748), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business.

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

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, we just finished here, on the Senate floor, some very, very important work for the people we represent and have the privilege to serve. It is what we are calling phase 3 of our very important response to this unprecedented pandemic that is hitting our country, the health of our country, and the economic health of our Nation.

So we acted. A number of us worked, over the past week, around the clock to put this legislation together, and I think it was a strong showing of bipartisan support.

I was on the floor a couple of days ago saying that what we needed to do were four key things: Put cash directly in the hands of hurting families in Alaska and throughout the country; deliver rapid relief to small businesses that are being crushed by this pandemic and having to lay off workers; stabilize key sectors of the economy to avoid more layoffs that are now quickly coming over the horizon and have started happening; and send a surge of new resources to medical professionals who are on the frontlines. We did that. We did that relatively quickly. It could have been faster, but those were our goals, and that is what we achieved here.

But here is a fact. This was legislation that was very important. It wasn't perfect, and there is probably a lot of mistakes here. We are going to need to correct them quickly. There are probably Americans who weren't covered in some way, shape, or form by this legislation, who need help, and we are going to need to cover them quickly. There are likely new challenges in this pandemic that seems to be changing every day—new challenges with regard to this crisis that we are going to need to address.

The final thing is, when we look at what we just did here, this was focused

on the immediate crisis—business interruptions and the health crisis, but what we need to be looking at is when we get through this crisis—and we will, more resilient and stronger than ever.

As I mentioned in my remarks the other day, some Washington Post reporters a couple of days ago questioned the mettle and resiliency of Americans. Maybe we are not as tough and strong as we used to be to get through these crises. They just need to go to Alaska and recognize how wrong they are in that or see some of the marines that I had the privilege of serving with for the last 26 years. They would recognize quickly that they are wrong. Of course, we have the mettle and tenacity to do this.

We need to be working on phase 4. Phase 4 is going to be the policies that we implement here in the Congress to turbocharge this economy, so when we are out of this crisis, we can come back fully, more strongly in a way that our economy was just 2 months ago.

There is a lot of work that I think we could be doing, and that we are likely going to have to be doing. A number of us are going to begin working on that phase 4 approach to this pandemic to turbocharge this economy once we get out of it. I am glad to start working on that with my colleagues here in the Senate.

So, as I said, there is a lot of work to do, but the Senate is getting ready for a recess for almost a month. That is what we are getting ready to do. The country is facing one of the biggest crises in our history, and the Senate is leaving town for a month. I happen to think this is a mistake. I think it sends the wrong signal to the people we serve. I think our duty station should be here, to be ready on a moment's notice to help the citizens that we have the privilege of serving, because if there is one thing about this crisis that we have already seen is that new challenges pop up every day, every minute, every hour, and, yet, we are going to go on recess for almost a month.

I don't understand this. I don't agree with it, and I certainly hope if and when our country needs us, if we see some big mistakes in this legislation, if we recognize whole groups of Americans don't get the relief they need and the Congress needs to act, that we are not going to just say: Well, we are on recess for 30 days. Sorry. We will get to you when we come back at the end of April.

I think that would be a real mistake because, as we are seeing in this crisis, there are a lot of answers that just can't wait until the end of April. There are a lot of challenges that we need to be addressing daily, and there are going to be more, and, yet, we will not be here to address them.

So, at a minimum, I hope that when our country needs us in the next month—and it is likely going to need us—that my colleagues will be ready, on a moment's notice, wherever they are, to come back to this body and get

to work to help the people we serve. I think it is very likely that that is going to happen in the next week or two or three, and I hope my colleagues stand ready to do that and not use the excuse that we will see at the end of April to address your problems, America. That is not what we need to be doing in the midst of this very, very serious unprecedented crisis where our citizens need our help.

We had a good start tonight—a very good start—but there is going to be a lot more, and I hope this body is ready to act quickly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 570 and 631.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Charles Williams, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy; and William Jordan Gillis, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

ORDERS FOR APRIL 20, 2020

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on April 20, the Senate proceed to executive session and the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 556. I further ask unanimous consent that at 5:30 p.m., the Senate vote on the nomination; and that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING JUDGE JAMES M. MUNLEY AND JUDGE A. RICHARD CAPUTO

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to remember and honor Judge James M. Munley and Judge A. Richard Caputo, who collectively served the Middle District of Pennsylvania as Federal district judges for over 40 years.

Judge Munley was a native of Archibald, PA. After graduating from the University of Scranton in 1958, he joined the U.S. Army and served until 1960. After his military service, Judge Munley enrolled at the Temple University School of Law and graduated in 1963. He clerked for the Honorable Michael J. Eagen on the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania before practicing law in Scranton from 1964 to 1978. From 1978 to 1998, Judge Munley served with distinction as a judge on the Lackawanna County Court of Common Pleas. In 1998, Judge Munley was nominated to a seat on the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania by President Bill Clinton. He was confirmed by the Senate and went on to serve the Middle District honorably for over two decades.

As a Federal judge, Judge Munley continued his family's tremendous legacy of public service and dedication to Pennsylvania. Both of his parents, Robert W. Munley and Marion L. Munley, and his grandfather, William J. Munley, served in the Pennsylvania General Assembly. Judge Munley has been remembered by members of the Pennsylvania legal community as a skilled, good-natured, and fair jurist who approached life with a sense of optimism that "was contagious in the best sense of the word." In his courtroom and in his life, he was known to treat everyone with the same dignity, respect, and kindness. U.S. District Judge Malachy E. Mannion remembered Judge Munley by noting: "What defined him most was just his sense of humanity. He was a great judge, but he was a greater human being."

Judge Caputo was born in Port Chester, NY, and raised in Rye, NY. He graduated from Brown University in 1960. After Brown, Judge Caputo enrolled in the University of Pennsylvania Law School and graduated in 1963. He went on to join the U.S. Air Force as an officer in the Judge Advocate General's Corps and served until