

In my trip in the October timeframe, I would see much the same expression from military and civilian. Our codel visited, and it was following my trip that I came back and said in a press conference, this situation is moving sideways.

My observations, together with the observations of others—some in our Government, some in the private sector—induced the administration—I am not suggesting we were the triggering cause, but we may have contributed—to go to an absolutely, as you say in the Navy, “general quarters” to study every aspect of the strategy which then was in place, and which now is clearly stated as late as yesterday by the admiral who will be the CENTCOM commander, wasn’t working.

I commend the President for taking the study and inviting a number of consultants. That whole process was very thorough.

The point the Senator is making, as late as December—mine in October, yours in December—we both gained the same impressions that no one was asking for additional United States troops at that time.

Ms. COLLINS. If the Senator will yield on that point, since the Senator was the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, as well, I would also share with our colleagues that the Senator presided over a hearing in mid-November at which General Abizaid, the central command general, testified before our committee that more American troops were not needed. He reported he had consulted widely with generals on the ground in Iraq, including General Casey, in reaching that conclusion.

I say to our colleagues that I think the record is clear. If you look at the findings of your trip from October, the testimony before the Committee on Armed Services from General Abizaid in November, what I heard in mid-December, I have to say, respectfully, I do not believe the President’s plan with regard to Baghdad—not Anbar but Baghdad—is consistent with what we were told.

Mr. WARNER. I thank my colleague.

We should add an important reference to work done by the Baker-Hamilton commission. They have made similar findings. They mention a slight surge, but in my study of that one sentence in that report, I don’t think they ever envisioned a surge of the magnitude that is here.

They can best speak for themselves and, indeed, yesterday there was testimony taken from two senior members of that commission, but I don’t know whether they were speaking for the entire commission, and whether, in their remarks, they may wish to amend portions of their report. I wasn’t present for that testimony.

I hope someone in the Foreign Relations Committee can make that clear. Were they speaking for the entire commission? Did they wish to have their remarks amend their report which we

followed? It was one of the guideposts we used, the important work of that group.

Again, we are doing what we think is constructive to help the Senate in preparing for its deliberations, to invite other colleagues to make suggestions. We stand open to consider other options that may come before the Senate.

At this point in time, our resolution is the same form as the resolution we filed here a week or so ago. We are not changing any of the procedures by which the Senate takes into consideration our points. Whether we will be able to utilize this as a substitute should other amendments be called upon the floor, the rules are quite complex on that matter, and I will not bring all of that into the record at this point. But there are certain impediments procedurally as to how this specific resolution could ever be actually used for the purposes of a substitute.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MURRAY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, in the colloquy I participated in with my distinguished colleagues, Senator BEN NELSON of Kansas and Senator COLLINS of Maine—and I take responsibility—somehow we had a misunderstanding about the status. We wish to send to the desk and ask that this be numbered a new S. Con. Res. and, therefore, have the same status as the current S. Con. Res. we had submitted a week ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and referred.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Chair. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I have already apologized to staff and others for having to wait around so long, but sometimes it takes a long time to get from here to there.

I, first of all, want to acknowledge the hard work of so many different people that allowed us to get where we are today, which certainly isn’t the finish line, but it is a starting point.

People have heard me on other occasions, on other matters, talk about the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER. In my 25 years in the Congress—and I say this without any reservation—I have

not had dealings with anyone who better represents, in my mind, what a Senator should be. Not only does he look the part and act the part, but he is truly what our Founding Fathers had in mind when they talked about this deliberative body.

So I appreciate very much the bipartisan work of the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER. He has worked with other Senators—I don’t know who he has worked with, but some I am aware of because I have read about them: Senators COLLINS, HAGEL, BEN NELSON, SNOWE, BIDEN, COLEMAN, and I am sure there are others.

Today Senator WARNER and others submitted a new version of his concurrent resolution regarding the increase of troop levels in Iraq. Senator LEVIN has taken that language, and tonight we will introduce it as a bill. It will be introduced as a bill because that is the only way we can arrive at a point where we can start a deliberate debate on this most important issue. We will introduce this as a bill which will begin the rule XIV process in order to get it to the calendar and allow the Senate to move to Senator WARNER’s legislation. We would prefer to do it as a concurrent resolution; however, that would only be the case if it would be open to complete substitute amendments, for obvious reasons.

In order to permit the Senate to consider amendments which are appropriate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senator WARNER’s concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 7, on Monday, February 5, at 12 noon, and that the entire concurrent resolution be open to amendments and that a cloture motion with respect to S. Con. Res. 2 be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, I would say to my friend, the majority leader, about a week ago, the distinguished majority leader indicated that we were going to follow the regular order, that the Biden resolution coming out of the Foreign Relations Committee would be the vehicle for our debate, and I gather, in listening to the distinguished majority leader—if I might ask, without losing my right to the floor, what is the status of the Biden resolution that came out of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. REID. A motion to invoke cloture was filed on that. After we complete work on the minimum wage bill, automatically we will vote on that. I say to my distinguished friend, cloture will not be invoked on that. What I would like is unanimous consent that we not have to vote cloture, that we just vitiate that vote and move to the Warner resolution and do that Monday. But, as I know, the distinguished Republican leader has only seen what I have given him, the last little bit, not because I didn’t want to give it to him but I didn’t have it. I certainly want

the leader to think about this during the night. I think it would be an expeditious way to get to this.

It has taken a lot of time. I haven't been involved in any of the negotiations. It was tempting, but I thought I would do more harm than good. I haven't been involved in any of the negotiations with the Senators whom I have mentioned here. I think it would be to the best interests of the Senate, majority and minority, to start Monday, as I have suggested, and allow Senators—I will say, at a subsequent time, when the distinguished Republican leader yields the floor, I am going to say that I want to work with the Republican leader in setting up a process for making sure people have the ability to offer reasonable amendments to this S. Con. Res. 7. That is my feeling. That is where we are with the Biden-Hagel-Snowe-Levin resolution that is before the Senate, or will be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the majority leader?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reclaiming the floor, reserving the right to object, so the Biden proposal which came out of the Foreign Relations Committee—I hear the majority leader—is no longer in consideration. If I understand the process correctly, it, too, could have been called up and an effort could have been made to turn it into a bill as well. If we were to stay in bill status, would it be the intent of the majority leader to fill up the tree?

Mr. REID. I will work with the Republican leader to take any suggestion the Republican leader would have as to how we can begin a debate. I would say in response to the statement, the reason I didn't put the Biden-Hagel matter in a rule XIV posture is that is not what we want to start debate on. There is a bipartisan group of Senators who believe the more appropriate matter is the Warner amendment. I don't know what happened in your caucus yesterday. In my caucus, there was near unanimity for the Warner resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, Madam President, Senator WARNER has been working diligently on this issue and cares deeply about it. We have had some discussions, but I had not seen Senator WARNER's proposal until just tonight. I am not complaining about that, but the text of it is new to me as well as to the Democratic leader.

It is still my hope that we could, as we discussed over the last couple of weeks in anticipation of this debate, enter into a consent agreement under which we would have had several different proposals in their entirety, realizing the difficulty of amending a concurrent resolution—several different proposals in their entirety that the Senate could consider. Maybe this is a better way to go, but it occurred to me that was probably the best way to go forward with this important debate.

Given the lateness of the hour and the newness of all of this, I am going to be constrained to object and will consider—I know we will continue this conversation in the morning in hopes of reaching some agreement that is mutually acceptable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WARNER. Will the Senator yield to me for a minute?

Mr. REID. I will yield to the Senator from Virginia, just making one brief statement. I hope we can still do that. We still would like to do that. I think this will be, as I said, a good place to start. I also want the record to reflect tonight that the mere fact that this is in bill form is as a result of meeting the very stringent rules of the Senate to get it to the floor so we can have a vote on this matter on Monday; that at any time we would agree to take this not being bill language and would be strictly a concurrent resolution language. We can do that anytime. The reasons for that are quite obvious. We don't want this—a concurrent resolution, the President doesn't have to sign it, whatever happens on it. We will be happy to work on that, too.

I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank both leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I join my leader in the objection because I do hope we can work it out, that we do not have to resort to a bill status. Everybody knows what the rules are and how that would then involve the President in a bill status. This should be a matter handled by the Senate and the other body, should they so desire.

I say to my distinguished leader, I did mention this afternoon that I was going to take these steps—basically the changes from the original one, which we filed a week ago. Senator NELSON, Senator COLLINS, and myself are still there. There is no major significant changes. We added a provision regarding the serious problem I and other Senators see—and we learned of it in the open session on Friday in the Armed Services Committee and again this morning in closed session—of the need to clarify this question of how a dual command can take place in each of the nine provinces of Baghdad between the Iraqi military and the U.S. military. And, General Keane, on Friday, said he is going to urge General Petraeus to try to work with that. I think that can be handled, but it has to be clarified.

The other thing is that some colleagues thought maybe we were laying the foundation of this body of the constitutional right of curtailing funds. That was never the intention, and that is made quite clear. The rest of it are changes that I believe are not ones that in any way affect basically the thrust of the original resolution, which was to try to put before the Senate as an institution the viewpoints of a bipartisan group—now 11 in number and

others I think desiring to join—such that if the Senate speaks in some way on this eventually, after a debate, it represents to the American public the best efforts of this institution to reach a degree of bipartisanship on an issue which I think is one of the most important that I have visited in my now 29th year in the Senate.

So I thank both leaders, and I join my distinguished leader at this time in the objection because I do hope we do not have to resort to legislative need of a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALAZAR). The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if we can't get such consent, then we will have to have a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to Senator LEVIN's bill on Monday at 12 noon. As for consideration of an amendment, as I stated in our colloquy, and I state now to the Chair, we will work with the Republican leader on an orderly process. He is an experienced legislator, as we all are, working on this bill. The problem we have is a narrow window of time because of the absolute requirement—absolute requirement to finish the continuing appropriations resolution by February 15 to avoid a total closure of the Federal Government—a total closure of the Federal Government. There would be more time to debate amendments, and I know the distinguished Republican leader is looking at this legislation tonight.

We didn't have to go through the cloture process on the motion to proceed to Senator WARNER's legislation. We simply want the Senate's will for the American people. I know that is what the minority wants, that is what the majority wants, and we have to figure out a process to do that. I am open to suggestions, but all I know, as I have told my two friends, there is no other way to get to the Warner resolution than how we have done it tonight. If during the night we can work out something to move forward to a debate starting Monday, I think it would be to the betterment of the Senate and the American people.

I repeat: It is done in bill form for the simple reason it is the only way to get it to the floor. I repeat now for the second time in front of the American people, at any time, either by unanimous consent or by a vote of the Democratic caucus, joining in with, I am sure, many Republicans, we will strip that language so it doesn't have to go to the President. We want this to be a resolution. This is something that is business within the family, the congressional family. The President doesn't have to be involved in this—only indirectly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, just briefly, I got the Warner resolution language about 7 o'clock. There are others on our side of the aisle, including Senator MCCAIN, Senator GRAHAM,

Senator CORNYN, and others, who are deeply involved in this issue and interested in how it is going to be disposed of. Senator WARNER has done his usual thoughtful job. He is probably the Senate expert on our side of the aisle in these matters, and his views of which way the Senate should proceed carry a lot of weight in the Senate. But I cannot at this late hour agree to this proposal tonight.

Having said that—and these will be my last thoughts, I believe, for the evening—I do think there ought to be a way to work this out. We have made considerable progress on our side of the aisle in narrowing down the proposals that we might want to offer. And I still think the preferred way to do it—and I think the majority leader believes this as well—is to have a number of different concurrent resolutions in the queue. The distinguished Senator from Virginia has made it clear that he is very uncomfortable, as he just expressed himself a moment ago, with taking the bill approach to this. The majority leader has indicated that is not his preference either. I think the message is: Let's see if we can't craft a unanimous consent agreement that is fair to both sides so that we can have this important debate on this exceedingly important issue next week.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I join in that because I think the operative phrase is to let the Senate work its will. Those are the first words I used in connection with this resolution when I laid it down last week. It is essential. This is one of the most important historic debates, as the distinguished leader—both leaders—have said. We should let this body work its will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, first let me commend the Senator from Virginia for his leadership and the contribution he has made to this historic debate, both for the Senate and for our Nation. Thank you because I think what you have presented in good faith is an effort to engage in a very important and historic debate. I thank you for that. The fact that you have drawn so much support from both sides of the aisle is a testament to the fine work you have done, and I am glad that you are here this evening in an effort to continue that work.

I would say to the minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, it is understandable that having been given this language and this information at this late hour that he wants a little more time to reflect on it, and I hope in the morning that we can come to the agreement that we all want. But to reiterate what the Senator from Nevada, the majority leader, has said, what we are seeking to do is what the minority leader has expressed, and that is to create the appropriate forum and the appropriate vehicle for the debate on this issue.

We struggle because the procedures in the Senate make it difficult to take

resolutions and amendments. It is clumsy, it is awkward, it is difficult to do. So what the majority leader has suggested is to treat this resolution as a bill for the purpose of amendment but then to remove that bill status so that there is no question as to whether it is going to the President. That gives us a chance to work our will, as the Senator from Virginia has said, using the bill-like approach to amendment and gives the majority and minority leaders a chance to work together to find a reasonable number of reasonable amendments so that we can, in fact, express our will on this critically important issue.

But I say to the minority leader from Kentucky, there is no guile in this proposal. It is an effort to find a reasonable way for both sides of the aisle to address this historic debate.

RETIREMENT OF ED GREELEGS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I come to the Senate today to say something I hoped I would never have to say. I am here to say thank you and farewell to my chief of staff for the past 17 years, Ed Greelegs, as he retires from the Senate.

This is the first time he has ever been on the floor of the Senate while it was in session. Ed is the kind of person who does his work without a lot of fanfare, without a lot of need for attention, but he does it so very well.

Some people are drawn to Congress because of what they think are the perks and power that come with the job. That is not what Ed Greelegs has given so much of his life to. For Ed, being a good public servant has always been privilege enough. The desire to help others, to try to translate our Nation's most cherished values into law and policies that meet the challenge of our times—that is what brought Ed Greelegs to the U.S. Congress and why he stayed all these years.

I will say without fear of contradiction that Ed is one of the most well liked, even beloved figures on Capitol Hill. All you have to do is walk down a hallway in the Capitol with Ed Greelegs and you will know what I mean. He knows everybody and everybody knows him. His easygoing nature and real caring for people means that he has made thousands of friends on Capitol Hill. From those who do the important work of maintaining and cleaning our offices to those at the highest levels, Ed knows them all.

We have a saying in our office, incidentally: Talk to Ed, he probably knows somebody. Whenever a new issue comes up, if you want to know who you can turn to and trust, Ed invariably knows whom to call. The relations he has made and nurtured on and off the Hill have been a great help to me for 17 years. I can't tell you the countless people who have never met Ed but who have benefitted nonetheless from the alliances he has forged, the common ground he helped plow, and the laws he helped pass.

One of Ed's great talents is recognizing and nurturing talent among others. If I had a young person who came to me anytime in the last 17 years who said, It has always been my dream to work on Capitol Hill, I would say, I want you to meet Ed Greelegs. He would patiently take the time to read the resume, talk to them, relate his life experience on Capitol Hill, and point them in a direction so they had a chance to realize their dream, as he had. They come back to me, years later, after success on the Hill or at some other branch of Government, and ask, How is Ed? That is the most common question I run into.

Ed grew up in nearby Wheaton, MD, and graduated from the University of Maryland. He came to Capitol Hill as an intern in 1970. In the 20 years between that first internship and becoming my chief of staff, Ed worked for Congressman Marty Russo of Illinois, Congressman Bob Eckhart of Texas on the House Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, then for Congressman Sam Gejdenson of Connecticut, and finally back to Congressman Russo's office for most of the 1980s. He worked briefly for the Consumer Federation of America and for Fannie Mae. But when he left the Hill to go into the private sector, his heart was still here. He even told me stories of jobs in the private sector where he never unpacked the boxes. He just never felt comfortable. It was not where he wanted to be. He might have been making more money, but he wasn't happy. He found his way back to Capitol Hill.

It was the leadership he showed in the office of Marty Russo that really brought Ed to my attention. In 1990, I persuaded him to come work for me as my chief of staff in the House of Representatives. Six years later, I decided to run for the Senate seat that belonged to my longtime friend and mentor, Paul Simon. Ed Greelegs was at my side in that effort.

I wondered how he would adjust, making that transition from the House to the Senate, but it was seamless. He knew just as many people on this side of the Hill as he continues to know on the House side.

For the 10 years I have served in the Senate, Ed Greelegs has been an unfailing source of wisdom and thoughtful advice. His quiet, wry sense of humor has helped to lighten the mood when things become too intense, and his decency, modesty, and great egalitarian spirit have helped remind everybody on our side of what is most important and why we are here.

There are a few things Ed loves more than the Senate. Among them are his wife Susan and his stepchildren Andrew and Amanda; another, his books. Ed has so many books you wouldn't believe it. He has a room, I understand, completely filled in his home. The fact that Susan stays with him despite this obsession on books tells you what a strong marriage they have. When I