amendment that was a $600 million emergency famine starvation relief amendment for sub-saharan Africa. There was a good bit of drama that occurred in the well, because the vote was so razor thin in difference. The final vote on a motion to table my amendment was agreed to 48 to 46. One vote change would have had the vote 47 to 47, and the motion to table my amendment would have failed, which would have given me the opportunity to go on and try to pass the amendment.

I have spoken to the substance, the reason for this amendment. There is not a person in the Senate who has not seen sights of those children with the spindly legs, the distended bellies, the thatched hair, and the soulful eyes. A lot of it is caused by the lack of rain. This has gone in cycles.

In 1985, I had the privilege of assisting my wife who had put together the first private group, other than the NGO organizations, responding to the famine in Ethiopia. My wife had raised the money in Florida. I was then a Member of the House of Representatives and had arranged for this stretch DC8 airplane. We rode the sacks of food into Addis Ababa and went into the feeding camps to see that food was distributed. Of course, when you see those starving children, and when my wife had the experience of holding a near lifeless African child in her arms, realizing in only a matter of moments that child would expire, it makes an impression. When famine comes back to that part of the land some 17 years later, it is hard to sit still.

Although my amendment was defeated yesterday by the razor-thin margin of one vote, I am not going to sit still. I am going to offer that amendment again and, fortunately, am in a parliamentary procedure by which I can do so because a very similar amendment to the one that was defeated yesterday had been filed by me.

For those Senators on the other side of the aisle—and there were four or five yesterday—who have been deeply touched by personal experiences in Africa, having seen that famine and the ravages of it on human beings, for those five or six on the other side of the aisle, and a score more who wanted to vote for that amendment, first, I thank you profoundly for your votes. You know, each one of you, who you are. And second, I want to say that we are going to have another chance. We are going to have another chance this afternoon.

I ask Senators to examine their hearts and see if they don't think that this is the right thing to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. REID. Mr. President, to help move things along and to notify Democrats as to whose amendment would come, I ask unanimous consent that the Democratic amendments—and Senator STEVENS may want to intersperse these with Republican amendments, and that is his privilege, but I ask unanimous consent that the next Democrat amendment be that of Senator KENNEDY, No. 123; Senator CLINTON, No. 89; Senator BINGAMAN, Nos. 126 and 138, and Senator CANTWELL, No. 108.

Mr. President, I also would say on each of these our members have agreed to time. But until the majority has seen the amendments, I am not going to ask time limits be established, even though we have established what our people have asked for in the way of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. THOMAS. I think probably there is no disagreement but at this time there needs to be some more agreement from our leader, so I object for the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, how much time do the Democrats have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes forty seconds.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, all we are trying to do is move things along. We have a right to have our amendments in the order we want. If we want to move this bill along, as the two leaders want, we cannot have these foolish—I know someone told the Senator to object. I am not calling the Senator foolish—these foolish objections. I know there is nothing that can be done because there is an objection that has been raised, but it is too bad.

Democratic Senators should be aware this is the order we are going to offer amendments.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, have these priorities been established already and agreed to with Mr. STEVENS?

Mr. REID. Yes, I have talked to Senator STEVENS. I talked to him this morning in the presence of the majority leader.

Mr. BYRD. What the distinguished whip is trying to do is simply to lay the prioritization in the RECORD, so Senators will not have to wait around; they will know when their amendments are going to be called up?

Mr. REID. Absolutely right. We have a number of Senators who have been waiting since yesterday or the day before to offer amendments. This is done so they are not standing around here waiting, so there is some kind of order in the Chamber rather than people trying to get recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Perhaps, when Senator STEVENS is back on the floor, you can get that consent. I would hope so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

The Senator from Wyoming.

PUBLIC-PRIVATE COMPETITION

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we would like to take the remainder of the time that has been assigned to this side of the aisle to talk about an amendment that would be before us this morning, the Mikulski amendment, which has been proposed as an amendment to the bill. It has to do with the implementation of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act, the FAIR Act, which was passed in 1998. It basically requires all Federal agencies to itemize jobs that are classified as noninherently governmental in nature, so there will be an opportunity for competition for those kinds of activities that the private sector, in the cases where it is appropriate, can be a competitor and can, indeed, do generally more efficiently than having it continue, as it has, with no competition.

In 2001 the FAIR Act inventory noted over 840,000 Federal jobs that are noninherently governmental. Those are jobs that could be done by contract, that could well be done by contract. There should be opportunity for that competition to exist.

The goal, of course, of the FAIR Act is to spend taxpayers' money as efficiently as possible, to ensure the Federal Government is not without competition with the private sector.

I think most of us would like to have as much done in the private sector as we reasonably can do. This, obviously, is not all the things Government does. There are inherently governmental programs, and they will continue to be that. The goal of the FAIR Act is to spend the taxpayers' money as efficiently as possible to ensure the Federal Government does not compete with the private sector. Wherever that can be, whether it is in contracting, whether it is the kinds of things that could be better done in the private sector, that is what we are seeking to do.

President Bush's Competitive Sourcing Initiative asked the Federal agencies to conduct private sector competitions in up to 15 percent of the jobs listed in the FAIR Act inventory. Of course, that is exactly what needs to be done, to identify these roles and then to have an opportunity to put them into the private sector and let the Government compete with the private sector and do it that way. It is a pretty basic sort of philosophy and something which I think most people would agree to do.

The amendment that has been put forth was to not allow the administration to move forward with their plans. I will later offer a copy of a letter that the President has sent through his administration, saying that they are opposed to this idea, that they want to move forward.

The fact is, during the Clinton administration, after the 1998 passage of the FAIR Act, there was very little done to implement it. Now we have an administration that believes they ought to implement the law as it exists, and we want to move forward in doing that.