

American people we would reduce a year and a half ago when the Budget Control Act was passed and do that in a sensible way. This is what we have consistently said. There is more flexibility in the law right now. We would be happy to give the President even more to achieve the cuts we promised the American people we would achieve. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Remember, Congressman RYAN, when he came up with one of these budgets, used these overseas contingency funds to balance his budget.

Let's not even worry about that for purposes of this conversation, the overseas contingency fund. Let's just talk about the war in Afghanistan. What my friend is saying is that it is OK to borrow money for the war in Afghanistan but not to use that same money to reduce pains being felt all over America today.

Even Joe Scarborough on "Morning Joe," a former Republican Congressman from Florida, said today that he can't believe that the pain is being felt all over America today and no one is concerned about the war in Afghanistan.

Does anyone think we are going to be fighting a war in Afghanistan 5 years from now, 10 years from now? That is the money people are trying to protect. I hope not. For the sake of my children and grandchildren, I hope we are not still fighting in Afghanistan 5 or 10 years from now.

We are asking to take a few dollars of the \$650 billion that is there—billion dollars—to relieve the pain we are feeling now for 5 months. That is it.

I think it is really unfair that it would be so easy to turn the sequester around and allow us to do something for a long term to take care of this issue, but, no, the Republicans like the pain.

One Republican Senator who came here last night said: Well, why don't we take the money from the construction fund for airports?

Those create jobs.

He said: Why don't we take it from essential air services?

That dog has been here and fought lots of times. That has been stripped bare.

As I indicated in my opening statement, this is supposed to be fair and equal. You can't jimmy things around. It is the same amount of money. The Republicans say: Well, it is the same amount of money, but give more pain to somebody else than the other; just balance it out. The pain is too severe; it can't be balanced out.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be

in a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with equal time divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the Republicans controlling the first half.

The Senator from Indiana.

FAA SEQUESTRATION DELAYS

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I rise as a member of both the Senate Appropriations Committee on Transportation and as a member of the Senate Commerce Committee to discuss what I believe is a shocking display of mismanagement and incompetence by the leadership of the Department of Transportation and the Federal Aviation Administration.

The Federal Aviation Administration says the sequester will result in as many as 6,700 delays per day. To put this in context, on the worst weather day in 2012, we had 2,900 flight delays. So the FAA's projected 6,700 delays per day would more than double the worst day in 2012.

To me, this is disturbing evidence of the lack of planning on the part of both the Department of Transportation and the FAA, leading up to what we all knew was going to take place—in fact, since the law was signed by the President. We have known for 1 year this may happen. The President signed it into law, and we are now many months down the line and suddenly the FAA came along just a few days ago and said: Oh, we just need to let you know, by the way, we are going to implement this part of the sequestration.

This across-the-board furlough is especially surprising given the previous announcements their guiding principle when implementing sequestration would be to enact a plan that "maintains safety and minimizes the impact to the highest number of travelers." Announcing 3 days or so before they implement this plan that potentially results in as many as 6,700 delays per day minimizes the impact of the highest number of travelers?

This is disingenuous. It is mismanagement at its worst. It is incompetence at its worst. It is a failure to do what every agency has been required to do; that is, plan for this. Now that it has been in law for several months, there is no excuse for simply saying: Oh, we didn't have time to put this in place, so this is what we are going to do.

I voted against sequestration because it treats every Federal program on an equal basis regardless of its necessity, its effectiveness, or whether it is an essential function of the Federal Government.

Clearly, keeping our skies safe and getting our passengers from point A to point B is an essential function. We need those air traffic controllers. The plan that was put forth by the FAA flies in the face of their own judgment and their own statements in terms of what they needed to do.

Instead of furloughing 47,000 employees and causing significant delays for travelers, they should have been seeking reductions elsewhere. We tried to give these essential agencies additional flexibility necessary to do so. Unfortunately, the President did not support that effort, and the majority party in the Senate did not support that effort. Therefore, they have no reason to point their fingers over here and say: Oh, sequestration is so terrible. We never should have been in this position in the first place.

The FAA, for the record, could have considered cutting back on the \$541 million it spends on consultants—in other words, those who have been hired to work at the FAA because the FAA can't do the job themselves, so they need to spend \$541 million to hire outside consultants—and the \$2.7 billion it spends on non-personnel costs. But instead of looking at how to better manage their own administration, they turned to furloughing up to 10 percent of the air traffic controllers, creating up to 6,700 delays per day on the traveling public.

Then they say they haven't had time to work this out. Haven't had time? They have had months' worth of time since the law was signed. How about the time people now wasted standing at airports for 3 and 4 hours waiting to board their plane and the overall disruption this causes? And this is in good weather. That in itself is a lame excuse the FAA has put forward.

I did not vote for the sequestration, as I said before. I thought it was an inadequate way to deal with the necessary need to cut spending here. But the Federal Government says: We would like to do that, but we can't afford to do that right now and still focus on the essential services and give them the opportunity to manage that. Clearly, the FAA and the Department of Transportation have not managed this well at all. This is incompetence.

As I mentioned, Congress was only informed just days ahead of the time of these furloughs. This decision kicked in to the surprise of the airlines and to the surprise of Congress. But clearly what we have learned, despite 1 year of advance warning and refusals to analyze all possible alternatives to minimize impacts to the traveling public—and it is hard to come to any other conclusion—is this is a politically motivated decision to inflict as much pain on Americans as possible in an effort to make the case that sequestration never should have taken place in the first place; that a 4-percent across-the-board cut to the FAA budget is simply something they can't manage. In other words, we would have asked the FAA to do what they did in 2010 with the money that was allocated to them, but they can't do that now. This is 2012–2013 and they need this extra money and they need these hundreds of billions of dollars to continue to hire consultants. They don't want to be asked to make the kinds of decisions every