scammers and levy fines from 1 year to 4 years. The bill also makes it easier for your cell phone carrier to lawfully block calls that aren't properly authenticated, which will ultimately help stop scammers from getting through to your phone. The TRACED Act also tackles the issue of spoofed calls—where scammers make the call appear as if it is coming from a known number. TRACED addresses the issue of one-ring scams, where international scammers try to get individuals to return their calls so they can charge them exorbitant fees.

The bill directs the Federal Communications Commission to convene a working group to address the problem of illegal robocalls being made to hospitals. There are too many stories of hospital telephone lines being flooded with robocalls, disrupting critical lines of communication for hours.

Will the TRACED Act completely solve the problem of illegal robocalls? No. But it will go a long way toward making it safe to answer your phone again, and it will help ensure those who exploit vulnerable individuals face punishment for their actions.

I am grateful to Senator MARKEY for partnering with me on this legislation. The Washington Post praised the TRACED Act as an example of ''good old-fashioned legislating.''

I am proud of the strong bipartisan support it received in both Houses of Congress. I look forward to monitoring the implementation of the TRACED Act and continuing to work to protect Americans from illegal and abusive robocalls.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator JOHNSON and I be able to complete our remarks prior to the cloture vote.

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

NOMINATION OF PAUL J. RAY

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, today I rise to speak in opposition to the nomination of Paul Ray to be the next Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, more commonly known as OIRA.

Although not many people outside of Washington have heard of OIRA, this office wields an important amount of influence over regulations that impact families, businesses, and communities in countless ways.

If confirmed, Mr. Ray would be responsible for reviewing health, labor, environmental, and many other protections, from safeguarding our source of drinking water to ensuring the cars we drive are safe.

In Michigan, communities like Flint, Oscoda, and Parchment cannot drink water from their own faucets without fear of ingesting toxic chemicals like lead or PFAS.

When meeting with Mr. Ray, I stressed the need to prioritize protections that provide safe and clean drinking water and preserve our Great Lakes and other natural resources. I appreciate that Mr. Ray listened to my concerns. He is clearly very smart and passionate about administrative law and the rulemaking process. However, Mr. Ray is relatively new to Federal service and has relied primarily on his recent tenure at the agency to demonstrate his qualifications.

Given his prior role, the best way for us to understand what Mr. Ray will do if confirmed is to take a closer look at what he has already done. In order to thoroughly examine his qualifications, we asked Mr. Ray to provide information about his tenure, which included reviews of proposals that would weaken critical protections for workers, veterans, children, disadvantaged communities, and the environment.

Unfortunately, the nominee and the agency's Office of General Counsel have refused to meaningfully respond to committee members' request for information or fully participate in the Senate's efforts to meet our constitutional responsibilities. While Mr. Ray expressed a commitment to transparency, his inability to ensure compliance with the committee's requests—including for material that is routinely provided to the public in response to the Freedom of Information Act—raises serious doubts about whether he will cooperate with Congress if confirmed.

Given the unprecedented actions taken by this administration to roll back safeguards, it would be irresponsible to confirm Mr. Ray to OIRA without an opportunity to thoroughly evaluate his record. I have sought to carefully consider Mr. Ray's nomination, but due to this serious lack of transparency, I cannot support his confirmation. For that reason, I will be voting no, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise to ask the Senate to confirm the nomination of Paul Ray to be the Administrator for the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget.

OIRA, as this office is commonly called, is the Federal Government's principal authority for reviewing executive branch regulations, approving government information collections, and overseeing the implementation of government-wide policies related to information policy, privacy, and statistical practices. The OIRA Administrator is responsible for reviewing and approving both rules and then final rules to ensure agencies conduct appropriate cost-benefit analyses.

Under President Trump, OIRA has conducted between 200 and 400 rule reviews each year, and it has made it an administrative priority to reduce the regulations and to control regulatory costs. That includes the important work of reviewing existing regulations to identify those that are outdated, harmful, or counterproductive and achieving this administration's initial goal of eliminating at least two regulations for every significant new one added.

The good news for our economy is that the administration far exceeded this initial goal by eliminating 22 outdated or harmful regulations for every new one added in 2017, and it has achieved a rate of 7½ regulations removed for each new regulation over the course of the administration. This has saved American families and businesses billions of dollars in compliance costs and has allowed businesses to spend that money and concentrate their efforts on growing their businesses and creating new products, services, and good-paying jobs.

I continue to believe this administration's dedication to regulatory reform and reduction is the single most important factor in the success of our economy, record low levels of unemployment, and growing wage levels, with wage growth being at its strongest at the lower end of our income spectrum.

It is important to note that Mr. Ray has already played a key role in this regulatory rationalization and its resulting economic success.

In his having previously led OIRA as its Acting Administrator and as its Associate Administrator, Mr. Ray has demonstrated the ability to carry out the office's multifaceted mission. In addition to his direct leadership experience at OIRA, he currently serves as the Senior Adviser to the Director of Regulatory Affairs, where he advises on regulations and the regulatory process. He also served as counselor to the Secretary of Labor, where he had a similar role.

Prior to these public service roles, Mr. Ray was an associate at Sidley Austin LLP, and he served as a law clerk to Supreme Court Justice Samuel Alito, as well as to Judge Debra Livingston of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Mr. Ray graduated magna cum laude from Hillsdale College and Harvard Law School.

Because of his background and demonstrated enthusiasm for dealing with regulatory matters, Mr. Ray is uniquely qualified to serve as the next OIRA Administrator. I am grateful to Mr. Ray for his willingness to serve, and I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote yes on his confirmation.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Paul J. Ray, of Tennessee, to be

Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, James M. Inhofe, John Barrasso, Roy Blunt, Todd Young, Shelley Moore Capito, Michael B. Enzi, Lisa Murkowski, John Cornyn, Steve Daines, Lindsey Graham, Chuck Grassley, Josh Hawley, Roger F. Wicker, Marsha Blackburn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Paul J. Ray, of Tennessee, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea'' and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 9 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blackburn	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Graham	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Romney
Braun	Hawley	Rounds
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Loeffler	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	McSally	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—5

Alexander	Moran	Warren
Booker	Perdue	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 50 and the nays are 45.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Texas.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it has now been more than 3 weeks since the House passed two Articles of Impeachment against the President of the United States. It was a big day for them at the time and one they have been dreaming of and speaking of since the President was inaugurated nearly 3 years ago.

For as long as the House Democrats have been wanting to impeach the President, they spent only a short time on the impeachment inquiry itself. As a matter of fact, they rushed headlong into the impeachment process, and now they are trying to make up for the mistakes that Chairman SCHIFF and Speaker PELOSI made when proceeding in the first place.

For example, now they want to relitigate things like executive privilege and whether the testimony of other witnesses should be included in the Senate impeachment trial. In other words, the House wants to tell the Senate how to conduct the trial.

Well, the House had its job to do—and, frankly, I think mishandled it—but now they have no say in the way the Senate conducts the impeachment trial, when and if Speaker PELOSI decides to send the articles over here. Twelve weeks was all it took for House Democrats to come up with what they believed was enough evidence to warrant a vote on Articles of Impeachment. I think they are experiencing some buyers' remorse. During that 12 weeks, we repeatedly heard House Democrats say how urgent the matter was, seemingly using urgency as an excuse for the slapdash investigation that they did and that they now regret. When the House concluded their rushed investigation and passed two Articles of Impeachment, we expected those articles to be sent to the Senate promptly.

This will be only the third time in American history where the Senate has actually convened a trial on Articles of Impeachment, so this is kind of a new, novel process for most of us here in the Senate. I think there are only 15 Senators who were here during the last impeachment trial of President Bill Clinton. Most of us are trying to get up to speed and figure out how to discharge our duty under the Constitution as a jury that will decide whether to convict or acquit and, if convicted, whether the President should be removed. This is serious.

Here we are, about 11 months before the next general election. It strikes me as a serious matter to ask 535 Members of the U.S. Congress to remove a President who was voted into office with about 63 million votes. This is very serious.

Well, despite the House leadership and Members stating time and again before the Christmas holidays how pressing the matter of impeachment was, there hasn't been an inch of movement in the House since those Articles of Impeachment were voted on. Here we are, more than 3 weeks later, and Speaker PELOSI is still playing her cat-and-mouse game with these Articles of Impeachment.

Last night, the Speaker appeared to have dug in her heels even deeper when she sent a letter to our Democratic colleagues about the delay. Following the majority leader's announcement that every Republican Senator supports using exactly the same framework that was used during the Clinton impeachment trial, the Speaker, as you might imagine, was not particularly happy because her gambit obviously didn't work. She has zero leverage and zero right to try to dictate to the Senate how we conduct the Senate trial, just as we had zero leverage and zero input into how the House conducted its responsibilities.

Speaker PELOSI told her caucus that the process is both unfair and ''designed to deprive Senators and the American people of crucial documents and testimony.'' Clearly, she doesn't think those documents and testimony were crucial enough to be included in the House investigation in the first place, but I digress.

The Speaker is trying to make the most out of a very bad situation of her own creation and intentionally trying to mislead the American people into thinking this framework prevents any witnesses from testifying, which is a false impression. It is demonstrably false. These are the same parameters that guided the Clinton impeachment process, during which witnesses were presented by deposition, giving sworn testimony that was then presented by the parties.

In 1999, 100 Senators agreed to this model. You would think if this was fair enough for President Clinton, it would be fair enough for President Trump. To apply a different standard would be just that—a double standard.

All 100 Senators agreed during the Clinton impeachment trial to allow the impeachment managers to present their case, to allow the President's lawyers to present their case, and then to permit the Senators to ask questions through the Chief Justice and to get additional information, and then—and only then—decide whether additional witnesses would be required.

Under the Clinton model, and now under the model that will be used—the Clinton model that we will be using in the Trump impeachment trial—if Members felt like they needed more information, they could vote to hear from additional witnesses. That opportunity is still available to them under the Clinton precedent that will be applied in the Trump impeachment trial. That is exactly what happened in the Clinton impeachment trial. After the arguments and evidence were presented, Senators voted to hear from three additional witnesses who were then deposed and whose sworn testimony was then offered.

You know, it makes me a little crazy when people say that this is a question