

are making great sacrifices, are left alone to fend for themselves, as they suffer the pain and anguish of post-traumatic stress disorder, the despair of losing friends to roadside bombs, or the depression and helplessness felt after multiple deployments that are stressing their families to the breaking point. This is not just about the armed servicemembers who commit suicide; it is about the deep and painful despair that drives them to do it. I know the Army says they have effective programs in place. But if that is true, where are the outcomes? Why do we have an ever-increasing suicide rate in the military?

The GAO just reported last week that the DOD—Department of Defense—does not even know if the post-deployment health reassessment surveys are being completed. Now, for those who may not have heard about this tool, the PDHRA, as it is called, surveys health and mental health concerns within 90 and 120 days of deployment. Well, how can DOD say they are good stewards of mental health when they cannot show us they are even doing these screenings?

The DOD's position on this amendment I am offering is that it "would establish a legislative mandate for programs already ongoing or within the Secretary's authority to establish. However, the administration supports the goals of this legislation and we look forward to working with Congress to address these concerns."

Well, they may have the current authority, but the numbers do not bear out they are actually doing it. Frankly, my staff has met—and I have also—with veterans in Iowa who say that while programs like this are in place and working well in some units, it is not a universal experience for Armed Services members. Too many brave young men and women are falling through the cracks, and the DOD is simply not doing a thorough job here. One ignored soldier who has had mental health problems—who is stressed out, who has seen his buddies' arms and legs disappear from bombings or had their lives taken away, who is on multiple deployments, and he has kids back home—one soldier with those kinds of stresses who is ignored is one soldier too many.

That is why Congress has to act to make this a priority. Yes, this is going to be a legislative mandate, and I intend it to be that. When GAO tells us that DOD cannot even tell us what they are doing, then I think it is time for a legislative mandate.

The military does an extraordinarily good job of treating our warriors' physical wounds and preventing death and disability. It is time to place an equal priority to treating their psychological wounds, their emotional wounds, and preventing suicides. That is exactly what this amendment will accomplish.

As I have said, there is already excellent language in the underlying Defense authorization bill to expand men-

tal health services for Active-Duty servicemembers. This amendment would add suicide prevention training for armed servicemembers and their families. It would add additional postdeployment assistance and a stigma reduction outreach campaign to aid in those efforts—a campaign to reduce the stigma of a soldier who is having mental health problems from seeking help.

We all know—those of us who have been in the military—what it is like. You do not want to admit you are having psychological problems, that this, somehow, is something you are not supposed to have happen to you. So you have to reduce the stigma of this so these young men and women who are having these problems will seek help and by getting that help will heal their psychological wounds.

It is a simple, commonsense approach to a pervasive, disturbing trend, as I said, a very growing problem in the military. So I hope all my colleagues can join with us to support the dedicated men and women serving our country and support this needed amendment.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I see the chairman of the committee. I think the work on the bill tonight is concluded, and I recommend we go off the bill and open the floor to morning business, if that is agreeable.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, would Senator SANDERS be willing, as a number of other colleagues are, that his remarks, although they relate to the bill, be in morning business?

Mr. SANDERS. Absolutely.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LEVIN. In that case, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we now move off the bill, move to morning business, and that Senators GRAHAM and LIEBERMAN be recognized and then Senator SANDERS be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I might say to my colleague, Senator GRAHAM has an airplane he is trying to catch.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wonder if Senator GRAHAM could speak for just a few minutes, and then we could turn to Senator SANDERS and then to Senator LIEBERMAN.

Mr. President, I ask Senator GRAHAM, how many minutes does he wish?

Mr. GRAHAM. Three minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we now move off the bill and go to morning business and that Senator GRAHAM be recognized for 3 minutes and then Senator SANDERS be recognized for up to 20 minutes. I want Senator LIEBERMAN to hear that request.

Mr. SANDERS. I say to the Senator, I listened to your speech.

Mr. LEVIN. That Senator SANDERS be recognized for up to 20 minutes and Senator LIEBERMAN be recognized for up to 20 minutes. That is my unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER. No objection.

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

The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Chair.

IRAQ

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I just want to let my colleagues know where I am coming from, along with Senator LIEBERMAN, that amendment No. 5368, I believe it is, is an amendment offered by Senator LIEBERMAN and myself that speaks of the surge, the success of the surge, how vital it was that we turn Iraq around, and the fact that the surge has worked.

General Petraeus said today in the Washington Post, I believe, that Iraq is still the central battlefield in the war on terror. Senator OBAMA has disagreed with that on numerous occasions, saying it is Afghanistan and Pakistan.

The truth is, the battle regarding the war on terror is an idea, not a place, and the fight now is in Iraq. Bin Laden said: Go to the land of the two rivers. Make sure we win that battle. Bin Laden has always seen Iraq as an outcome-determinative event. So does General Petraeus. So does Senator MCCAIN, Senator GRAHAM, and Senator LIEBERMAN.

So the good news is that battle has taken place in Iraq between al-Qaida, the Iraqi people, and the coalition forces, and we have greatly diminished al-Qaida. They suffered a mighty blow at the hands of fellow Muslims who turned on al-Qaida after tasting their agenda. I cannot think of a more appropriate topic for the Senate to take up than to comment on what I think is the most historic, successful counterinsurgency operation in military history, to memorialize that it has worked, to acknowledge those who sacrificed to make it work, those who led our men and women in battle. This, to me, is very appropriate and important. It was a year ago today that General Petraeus testified about his plan in Iraq, and a year later we see stunning success militarily, economically, and politically. So I believe with all the passion I can muster about this topic that the Senate needs to take this up, discuss it, debate it, and vote on it.

I thank Senator LIEBERMAN for his steadfast leadership over the last year. I say to the Senator, you, my friend, will go down in history as being one of the Senators who stood up at a time when the country needed people to speak out. We turned this war around because of people like yourself and Senator MCCAIN but mainly because of