

And one thing is clear—those efforts were not enough. We are still not getting straight answers from the VA. We are still getting out-of-date information. We still do not have a plan from the VA to care for the veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan.

So yes, there were hearings—I think we'd all agree that after a \$3 billion error that hurt our veterans there better be hearings—but they were not enough. And we need more oversight and more accountability if we're going to make sure veterans do not get hurt again.

The Senator from Idaho asked—why now? Why am I calling for more oversight now? Because the GAO just released its report. I didn't tell the GAO how long to take in its investigation. When it had the facts, it released them, and I spoke up immediately. In fact, I think the Senator from Idaho will remember the morning the GAO released its report I shared the results with our Veterans Affairs Committee at a public hearing.

I thought everyone on the committee needed to know immediately that government investigators found the VA had not told us about the problems it knew about and that the VA is providing quarterly reports that are late and based on old information. Simply put, I spoke out when we got the facts.

I would add that if anyone believes that my remarks on Tuesday are the first time I have stood up and spoke out for our veterans—they just have not had their eyes open over the past few years. And I would remind my colleagues that there is no moratorium on speaking out for our veterans. Whenever we learn facts that affect America's veterans, I'm going to share them, and I'm not going to stop speaking out until we in Congress do the right thing.

Furthermore, unless we change the path we are on, we will be talking about this issue next September, the September after that, and every month in between. This is not going away.

So we in the Senate debate a lot of issues—none more significant than the issue of going to war. We are at war, and this body has a responsibility to meet our obligations in prosecuting that war—that includes taking care of our veterans. Today, we are not meeting that obligation. That is not just my opinion. It is the only conclusion a reasonable person could draw from the GAO report. And however inconvenient that may be—that is a fact.

Mr. President, I repeat my conclusion from my remarks here on Tuesday. Veterans deserve better, and this Senate and America can do better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

#### AGRICULTURAL DISASTERS

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I rise to express my support for providing relief to agricultural producers nationwide.

Earlier today Senator CONRAD from North Dakota led a debate on the floor regarding agricultural disasters; especially the severe drought causing severe loss of crops all across America, and the need to extend a helping hand to farmers.

We always hope to stay out of the disaster business, unfortunately Mr. President, this has indeed been a very unusual year. In August of 2006, in my State of Georgia, 155 of 159 counties were designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as primary natural disaster areas due to losses caused by drought and excessive temperatures.

Cotton and peanut harvests are underway today in the State and, unfortunately, the Department of Agriculture's most recent crop summary rates dryland fields in poor to fair condition, with much lower yields than usual. If peanut production forecasts are realized, we could have the lowest production yields on peanuts since 1980. Losses extend beyond the fields and have had a serious effect on livestock producers as well. For example, in addition to losses due to drought, many pastures and hayfields have experienced severe armyworm infestation.

My staff continues to receive calls from across the State with concerns about crop and pasture conditions. I have personally heard the calls and seen the need for agricultural disaster assistance throughout Georgia. As chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I convened eight farm bill hearings across the country this summer. I will have to say that in traveling to these regions and visiting with the producers, I can report that there has been severe disasters occurring in each and every section of our country from an agricultural standpoint. Rural America is hurting.

While the Senate did not have the opportunity today to proceed with the vote on this very important issue, I want to be clear that I do support disaster assistance. Earlier this year, the Senate passed disaster assistance in the fiscal year 2006 supplemental appropriations bill. Unfortunately, that provision was dropped in conference. Since then, the situation has greatly worsened. Fortunately, we currently have a disaster package in the Senate agriculture appropriations bill, which we expect to complete after the November elections.

The appropriate place to address agriculture disaster is in the agriculture appropriations bill. However, we will need to refine and improve this disaster package based upon current circumstances. For example, the current disaster package provides assistance only for losses for the 2005 crop-year. Unfortunately, the losses in 2006 appear to be more extensive, more widespread, and more severe than the 2005 losses. The University of Georgia Center for Agribusiness and Economic Development estimates that at this point agriculture production losses may total over \$819 million in Georgia alone.

At the current time, we may not know the full extent of the 2006 crop damage, but it is evident in looking across the country that crop and livestock assistance is needed.

The Secretary of Agriculture has agreed with us on this point. Earlier this summer he announced in the Dakotas that a disaster indeed had taken place across America. However, he provided what I thought, frankly, was a fairly nominal response to the issue.

America's farmers provide this country the safest, most affordable food and fiber supply of any country in the world. It is our duty to stand by them in this time of need.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

#### READING FIRST

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the Education Department's inspector general released a blistering report last week about a program called Reading First. The inspector general reported that Education Department officials, one, mismanaged the program; two, steered school contracts to publishers they favor and away from others; three, flagrantly ignored Federal laws on maintaining local and State control of school curricula.

These are serious findings by the inspector general. Reading First is one of the largest programs in the Education Department. Congress has appropriated about \$5 billion, or about a billion dollars for each of the past 5 years. So when we learn that a program of this size is being mismanaged, that laws are being broken, we need to take pause and investigate further.

Soon after Reading First was created, a number of publishers, researchers, and local school officials complained that the Department favored certain reading programs over others. They claimed that the Department pressured States and local school districts—sometimes subtly and sometimes bluntly—to purchase its preferred programs and reject others.

These kinds of activities are illegal. The law that established the Education Department states:

No provision of a program administered by the Secretary or by any other officer of the Department shall be construed to authorize the Secretary or any such officer to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, school, or school system . . . over the selection or consent of . . . textbooks, or other instructional materials by any educational institution or school system, except to the extent authorized by law.

Now, when we established the Department of Education—and I happened to be here at that time; I was in the House of Representatives at that time—the hue and cry went up to those who were opposed to establishing the Department of Education that the Department of Education would begin telling local school districts what to