

system and trust them—the airlines—to manage our skies and the increasing air traffic. On top of that, here on the other side, they say: Well, let's finance the airlines' control of our skies through user fees paid for by the general aviation community.

We know that several airlines in the past year have had to cancel thousands of flights and strand passengers at airports for hours because they couldn't effectively manage their IT systems. How can we trust airlines to govern an entity that manages our skies when they can't even manage their own basic IT systems?

The FAA, our government's Federal Aviation Administration, safely and effectively manages the largest and most complex airspace in the world. Supporters of air traffic control privatization can cite other countries all they want that have privatized, but none of those privatized systems hold a candle to the complicated and densely populated air traffic system the FAA has accomplished.

Rather than helping the FAA continue its progress toward modernizing our air traffic control system through NextGen—that is being implemented as we speak, and in 3 years, the process of handing off most of the air traffic to satellites instead of ground-based radar—that is in just 3 years. On the other hand, the transition to a privatized air traffic control entity is only going to disrupt and delay the FAA's modernization efforts.

One has to ask, if it isn't broken, what exactly is the administration trying to fix?

We actually have real issues that need to be addressed in this FAA bill, such as continuing to safely integrate drones into our Nation's airspace, reforming the process for aircraft certification, and, very importantly, helping the FAA hire more air traffic controllers. We need to work to ensure that consumers, the flying public, have real protections in place that protect them when things go wrong. I wish the administration would focus on those issues, which received nearly unanimous support in the Senate last year, rather than try to up-end the world's safest air traffic control system.

Let's not get sidetracked by proposals that have neither bipartisan consensus in Congress nor agreement among aviation stakeholders. Last year we came very close to enacting a bipartisan and comprehensive FAA bill. It passed the Senate 95 to 3, although it didn't have air traffic control privatization. I know we can do it again, and I look forward to working with Senator THUNE and the members of the committee, who will have the first crack at this when we bring up the FAA bill. Hopefully we can go with a consensus bill that will give us an authorization for the FAA for many years—5 to 7 years into the future—so that we can have the certainty of the authorization with which to continue to build a safe airline and air safety

record and implement the next generation of air traffic control.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question now occurs on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. LEAHY. 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.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 138 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Gardner	Nelson
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Paul
Blumenthal	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Peters
Boozman	Harris	Portman
Brown	Hassan	Reed
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Cantwell	Heinrich	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cardin	Heller	Rubio
Carper	Hirono	Sanders
Casey	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Schatz
Cochran	Isakson	Schumer
Collins	Johnson	Scott
Cooms	Kaine	Shaheen
Corker	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	King	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Strange
Cotton	Lankford	Tester
Crapo	Leahy	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Udall
Daines	Manchin	Van Hollen
Donnelly	Markley	Warner
Durbin	McCain	Warren
Enzi	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Feinstein	Moran	Wyden
Fischer	Murphy	Young

NOT VOTING—10

Bennet	Menendez	Tillis
Booker	Merkley	Toomey
Duckworth	Murkowski	
Flake	Sullivan	

The resolution (S. Res. 176) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the preamble is agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 24, 2017, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table.

The Senator from Nevada.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HELLER. 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.

The Senator from Nevada.

## S. RES. 176

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of S. Res. 176, which was just adopted by the Senate.

This important resolution reaffirms the Jerusalem Embassy Act of 1995, which recognized Jerusalem as the capital of Israel by moving the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

As many of my colleagues know, this week marks 50 years since Jerusalem was unified during the Six-Day War, and I am pleased to have joined Leader McConnell and Senator Schumer as an original cosponsor of this resolution to commemorate this important anniversary. I thank them for their leadership on this issue, and I am proud to stand beside them in our commitment to one of our oldest and strongest allies, Israel.

This resolution sends a message to our friends in Israel, and that message is this: We support moving our Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

Let me explain why this issue is so important to me.

It has been 22 years since the Jerusalem Embassy Act became law. However, our country's promise to move the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem is yet to be fulfilled. It has been 22 years, and we still have not moved our Embassy. We have had 22 years to enforce this law, and year after year we continue to turn a blind eye to what we are expected—and what we promised—to do. Jerusalem is the capital of Israel, and that is where the U.S. Embassy should be located. Now is the time to move the Embassy as we committed to do so many years ago.

By the way, many Nevadans feel the same way I do. One Nevadan who supports relocating the Embassy said in a letter to me:

It is never wrong to do the right thing. And moving our embassy to Jerusalem is the right thing to do.

As we commemorate the reunification of Jerusalem, I encourage my colleagues to honor our commitment and to show Israel, one of our oldest and closest allies, that we stand with them today more than ever.

Today's vote represents an important step in the right direction, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in finally enacting what is current law.