

people in Kentucky were injured. Forty-eight Kentucky counties suffered damage from the storms and tornadoes Friday evening. I am told that about 19,000 people were without power yesterday. This morning my colleague Senator PAUL and I sent a letter to the President urging him to approve Gov. Steven Beshear's request for Federal assistance.

Yesterday I had a chance to visit arguably the hardest hit of our communities, West Liberty, KY. It was a scene of total devastation. The whole community has either been evacuated or is in the process of being evacuated. The county judge—in our State the county judge is like the county executive in a number of States—Tim Conley, and Mayor Rupe, the mayor of West Liberty, and I toured, frankly, what little is left of the community. I ran into the county attorney there. Not only had her home been wiped out, her office had been wiped out.

The most poignant story of the day was when one of the local residents came up to one of my assistants and said: Here, I found \$70. It doesn't belong to me. I want you to take it and see to it that it is used for the community.

My assistant said: No one knows where the \$70 came from or who it belongs to and you are wiped out. Why don't you keep it?

This citizen of West Liberty, KY, said: "I just wouldn't feel right about it."

"I just wouldn't feel right about it." Those are the kind of people who are in West Liberty, KY. Those are the kind of people today who are homeless, who have lost friends and relatives. Of course, in a town that is devastated there are no jobs. Where do people go to work when their place of business has been wiped out?

FEMA is on the ground, and we will do everything we can to try to help these good folks rebuild their lives. Similar stories are the case in a number of other Kentucky counties, but West Liberty I singled out because it was probably the most devastated of any of our communities.

I applaud the work of the first responders. There were people from all over my State who immediately came to the site, some of them with some official responsibility—they were with the Red Cross or they were with the National Guard. In fact, there were 400 National Guard troops mobilized across the State in these severely hit areas. But many of the people I ran into in West Liberty, KY, were simply people who got in their cars, loaded them up with bottled water and whatever food they could come up with, and went there to be helpful.

There was one restaurant in another town that sent in a very large number of barbecue sandwiches just to try to feed the people who were there trying to help get started. I went to the command center. Of course, one of the biggest questions in a situation such as

that is, what do you do first? Obviously, the first effort to get the power back on. The AEP, the power company, was there trying to get the power up and running. Then they had a priority chart: What do you do second? What do you do third?

I want to express to them and say again on the Senate floor today, we are going to be there for these good folks not only in West Liberty but in the other counties that were hit in our State. That is why FEMA exists. They do a good job. Hopefully, it will not require any additional funding for us to have to appropriate. Hopefully, they will have enough funds in their budget to take care of this, but if there is a shortfall we will be there to be helpful.

I wanted to share with my colleagues today the devastation to which we were subjected last weekend. It is reminiscent of a tornado that hit Kentucky in the 1970s. I remember it went into my mother and father's neighborhood. The house next door to them was obliterated. The houses across the street were obliterated. Amazingly enough, my mothers and father's house seemed largely untouched. There were very few homes in West Liberty, KY, yesterday or Friday night that were untouched. It came through there with a stunning force.

I heard one story I will also relate. The county judge was in a building and literally grabbed somebody by the leg and pulled him inside the building as the storm was attempting to suck him out into the street. He was able to save that person. So the incredible force of these massive tornadoes is truly destructive, and we will help local residents get their lives back together as soon as we possibly can.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved. Under the previous order, there will now be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that I be allowed to speak in morning business for as much time as I may consume.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SYRIA

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, after a year of bloodshed, the crisis in Syria

has reached a decisive moment. It is estimated that more than 7,500 lives have been lost. The United Nations has declared that Syrian security forces are guilty of crimes against humanity, including the indiscriminate shelling of civilians, the execution of defectors, and the widespread torture of prisoners.

Bashar al-Asad is now doing to Homs what his father did to Hama. Aerial photographs procured by Human Rights Watch show a city that has been laid to waste by Asad's tanks and artillery. A British photographer who was wounded and evacuated from the city described it as "a medieval siege and slaughter." The kinds of mass atrocities that NATO intervened in Libya to prevent in Benghazi are now a reality in Homs. Indeed, Syria today is the scene of some of the worst state-sponsored violence since Milosevic's war crimes in the Balkans or Russia's annihilation of the Chechen city of Grozny.

What is all the more astonishing is that Asad's killing spree has continued despite severe and escalating international pressure against him. His regime is almost completely isolated. It has been expelled from the Arab League, rebuked by the United Nations General Assembly, excoriated by the U.N. Human Rights Council, and abandoned by nearly every country that once maintained diplomatic relations with it. At the same time, Asad's regime is facing a punishing array of economic sanctions by the United States, the European Union, the Arab League, and others—measures that have targeted the assets of Asad and his henchman, cut off the Central Bank and other financial institutions, grounded Syria's cargo flights, and restricted the regime's ability to sell oil.

This has been an impressive international effort, and the administration deserves a lot of credit for helping to orchestrate it.

The problem is the bloodletting continues. Despite a year's worth of diplomacy backed by sanctions, Asad and his top lieutenants show no signs of giving up and taking the path into foreign exile. To the contrary, they appear to be accelerating their fight to the finish and they are doing so with the shameless support of foreign governments, especially in Russia, China, and Iran. A steady supply of weapons, ammunition, and other assistance is flowing to Asad from Moscow and Tehran. As the Washington Post reported yesterday, Iranian military and intelligence operatives are likely active in Syria, helping to direct and sharpen the regime's brutality. The Security Council is totally shut down as an avenue for increased pressure, and the recently convened Friends of Syria contact group, while a good step in principle, produced mostly rhetoric but precious little action when it met last month in Tunisia. Unfortunately, with each passing day, the international response to Asad's atrocities is being overtaken by events on the ground in Syria.

Some countries are finally beginning to acknowledge this reality as well as its implications. Saudi Arabia and Qatar are calling for arming opposition forces in Syria. The newly elected Kuwaiti Parliament has called on their government to do the same. Last week, the Supreme Allied Commander of NATO, ADM James Stavridis, testified to the Senate Armed Services Committee that providing arms to opposition forces in Syria could help them shift the balance of power against Asad. Most importantly, Syrians themselves are increasingly calling for international military involvement. The Opposition Syrian National Council recently announced that it is establishing a military bureau to channel weapons and other assistance to the Free Syrian Army and armed groups inside the country. Other members of the Council are demanding a more robust intervention.

To be sure, there are legitimate questions about the efficacy of military operations in Syria and equally legitimate concerns about their risks and uncertainties. It is understandable that the administration is reluctant to move beyond diplomacy and sanctions. Unfortunately, this policy is increasingly disconnected from the dire conditions on the ground in Syria, which has become a full-blown state of armed conflict. In the face of this new reality, the administration's approach to Syria is starting to look more like a hope than a strategy. So, too, does their continued insistence that Asad's fall is "inevitable." Tell that to the people of Homs. Tell that to the people of Idlib or Hama or the other cities that Asad's forces are now moving against. Nothing in this world is predetermined, and claims about the inevitability of events can often be a convenient way to abdicate responsibility.

But even if we do assume that Asad will ultimately fall, that may still take a long time. In recent testimony in the Armed Services Committee, the Director of National Intelligence James Clapper said if the status quo persists, Asad could hang on for months, probably longer. And that was before Homs fell. So to be clear, even under the best-case scenario for the current policy, the cost of success will likely be months of continued bloodshed and thousands of additional lives lost. Is this morally acceptable to us? I believe it should not be.

In addition to the moral and humanitarian interests at stake in Syria, what is just as compelling, if not more so, are the strategic and geopolitical interests. Put simply, the United States has a clear national security interest in stopping the violence in Syria and forcing Asad to leave power. In this way, Syria is very different than Libya. The stakes are far higher, both for America and some of our closest allies.

This regime in Syria serves as a main forward operating base of the Iranian regime in the heart of the Arab world.

It has supported Palestinian terrorist groups and funneled arms of all kinds, including tens of thousands of rockets, to Hezbollah in Lebanon. It remains a committed enemy of Israel. It has large stockpiles of chemical weapons and materials and has sought to develop a nuclear weapons capability. It was the primary gateway for the countless foreign fighters who infiltrated Iraq and killed American troops. Asad and his lieutenants have the blood of hundreds of Americans on their hands. Many in Washington fear that what comes after Asad might be worse. How could it be any worse than this?

The end of the Asad regime would sever Hezbollah's lifeline to Iran, eliminate a longstanding threat to Israel, bolster Lebanon's sovereignty and independence, and inflict a strategic defeat on the Iranian regime. It would be a geopolitical success of the first order. More than all of the compelling moral and humanitarian reasons, this is why Asad cannot be allowed to succeed and remain in power. We have a clear national security interest in his defeat, and that alone should incline us to tolerate a large degree of risk in order to see that this goal is achieved.

Increasingly, the question for U.S. policy is not whether foreign forces will intervene militarily in Syria. We can be confident that Syria's neighbors will do so eventually if they have not already. Some kind of intervention will happen with or without us. So the real question for U.S. policy is whether we will participate in this next phase of the conflict in Syria and thereby increase our ability to shape an outcome that is beneficial to the Syrian people and to us. I believe we must.

The President has characterized the prevention of mass atrocities as "a core national security interest." He has made it the objective of the United States that the killing in Syria must stop, that Asad must go. He has committed the prestige and credibility of our Nation to that goal, and it is the right goal. However, it is not clear that the present policy can succeed. If Asad manages to cling to power—or even if he manages to sustain the slaughter for months to come—with all the human and geopolitical costs that entails, it would be a strategic and moral defeat for the United States. We cannot—we must not—allow this to happen.

For this reason, the time has come for a new policy. As we continue to isolate Asad diplomatically and economically, we should work with our closest friends and allies to support opposition groups inside Syria, both political and military, to help them organize themselves into a more cohesive and effective force that can put an end to the bloodshed and force Asad and his loyalists to leave power. Rather than closing off the prospects for some kind of negotiated transition that is acceptable to the Syrian opposition, foreign military intervention is now the nec-

essary factor to reinforce this option. Asad needs to know that he will not win.

What opposition groups in Syria need most urgently is relief from Asad's tank and artillery sieges in the many cities that are still contested. Homs is lost for now, but Idlib and Hama and Qusayr and Deraa and other cities in Syria could still be saved. But time is running out. Asad's forces are on the march. Providing military assistance to the Free Syrian Army and other opposition groups is necessary, but at this late hour that alone will not be sufficient to stop the slaughter and save innocent lives. The only realistic way to do so is with foreign air power.

Therefore, at the request of the Syrian National Council, the Free Syrian Army, and local coordinating committees inside the country, the United States should lead an international effort to protect key population centers in Syria, especially in the north, through air strikes on Asad's forces. To be clear, this will require the United States to suppress enemy air defenses in at least part of the country. The ultimate goal of air strikes should be to establish and defend safe havens in Syria, especially in the north, in which opposition forces can organize and plan their political and military activities against Asad. These safe havens could serve as platforms for the delivery of humanitarian and military assistance, including weapons and ammunition, body armor, and other personal protective equipment, tactical intelligence, secure communications equipment, food and water, and medical supplies. These safe havens could also help the Free Syrian Army and other armed groups in Syria train and organize themselves into more cohesive and effective military forces, likely with the assistance of foreign partners.

The benefit for the United States in helping to lead this effort directly is that it would allow us to better empower those Syrian groups that share our interests—those groups that reject al-Qaida and the Iranian regime and commit to the goal of an inclusive democratic transition as called for by the Syrian National Council. If we stand on the sidelines, others will pick winners, and this will not always be to our liking or in our interest. This does not mean the United States should go it alone. I repeat: This does not mean that the United States should go it alone. We should not. We should seek the active involvement of key Arab partners such as Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Jordan, and Qatar, and willing allies in the EU and NATO, the most important of which in this case is Turkey.

There will be no U.N. Security Council mandate for such an operation. Russia and China took that option off the table long ago. But let's not forget: NATO took military action to save Kosovo in 1999 without formal U.N. authorization. There is no reason why the

Arab League or NATO or a leading coalition within the Friends of Syria contact group, or all of them speaking in unison, could not provide a similar international mandate for military measures to save Syria today.

Could such a mandate be gotten? I believe it could. Foreign capitals across the world are looking to the United States to lead, especially now that the situation in Syria has become an armed conflict. But what they see is an administration still hedging its bets—on the one hand insisting that Asad's fall is inevitable but, on the other, unwilling even to threaten more assertive actions that could make it so.

The rhetoric out of NATO has been much more self-defeating. Far from making it clear to Asad that all options are on the table, key alliance leaders are going out of their way to publicly take options off the table. Last week, NATO Secretary General Rasmussen said that the alliance has not even discussed the possibility of NATO action in Syria, saying: "I don't envision such a role for the alliance." The following day, the Supreme Allied Commander, ADM James Stavridis, testified in the Senate Armed Services Committee that NATO has done no contingency planning—none—for potential military operations in Syria.

That is not how NATO approached Bosnia or Kosovo or Libya. Is it now the policy of NATO—or the United States, for that matter—to tell the perpetrators of mass atrocities in Syria or elsewhere that they can go on killing innocent civilians by the hundreds of thousands and the greatest alliance in history will not even bother to conduct any planning about how we might stop them? Is that NATO's policy now? Is that our policy? Because that is the practical effect of this kind of rhetoric. It gives Asad and his foreign allies a green light for greater brutality.

Not surprisingly, many countries, especially Syria's neighbors, are also hedging their bets on the outcome in Syria. They think Asad will go, but they are not yet prepared to put all their chips on that bet—even less so now that Asad's forces have broken Homs and seem to be gaining momentum.

There is only one nation—there is only one nation—that can alter this dynamic, and that is the United States of America. The President must state unequivocally that under no circumstances will Asad be allowed to finish what he has started; that there is no future in which Asad and his lieutenants will remain in control of Syria; and that the United States is prepared to use the full weight of our air power to make it so. It is only when we have clearly and completely committed ourselves that we can expect other nations to do the same. Only then would we see what is really possible in winning international support to stop the killing in Syria.

Are there dangers and risks and uncertainties in this approach? Absolu-

tely. There are no ideal options in Syria. All of them contain significant risk. Many people will be quick to raise concerns about the course of action I am proposing. Many of these concerns have merit but none so much that they should keep us from acting.

For example, we continue to hear it said that we should not assist the opposition in Syria militarily because we do not know who these people are. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton repeated this argument just last week, adding that we could end up helping al-Qaida or Hamas. It is possible that the administration does not know much about the armed opposition in Syria, but how much effort have they really made to find out, to meet and engage these people directly? Not much, it appears. Instead, much of the best information we have about the armed resistance in Syria is thanks to courageous journalists, some of whom have given their lives to tell the story of the Syrian people.

One of those journalists is a reporter working for Al-Jazeera named Nir Rosen, who spent months in the country, including much time with the armed opposition. Here is how he described them recently:

The regime and its supporters describe the opposition, especially the armed opposition, as Salafis, Jihadists, Muslim Brotherhood supporters, al-Qaeda and terrorists. This is not true, but it's worth noting that all the fighters I met . . . were Sunni Muslims, and most were pious. They fight for a multitude of reasons: for their friends, for their neighborhoods, for their villages, for their province, for revenge, for self-defense, for dignity, for their brethren in other parts of the country who are also fighting. They do not read religious literature or listen to sermons. Their views on Islam are consistent with the general attitudes of Syrian Sunni society, which is conservative and religious.

Because there are many small groups in the armed opposition, it is difficult to describe their ideology in general terms. The Salafi and Muslim Brotherhood ideologies are not important in Syria and do not play a significant role in the revolution. But most Syrian Sunnis taking part in the uprising are themselves devout.

He could just as well have been describing average citizens in Egypt or Libya or Tunisia or other nations in the region. So we should be a little more careful before we embrace the Asad regime's propaganda about the opposition in Syria. We certainly should not let these misconceptions cause us to keep the armed resistance in Syria at arm's length because that is just self-defeating. And I can assure you that al-Qaida is not pursuing the same policy. They are eager to try to hijack the Syrian revolution, just as they have tried to hijack the Arab spring movements in Egypt and Tunisia and Libya and elsewhere. They are trying, but so far they are failing. The people of these countries are broadly rejecting everything al-Qaida stands for. They are not eager to trade secular tyranny for theocratic tyranny.

The other reason al-Qaida is failing in Tunisia and Egypt and Libya is be-

cause the community of nations—especially the United States—has supported them. We are giving them a better alternative. The surest way for al-Qaida to gain a foothold in Syria is for us to turn our backs on these brave Syrians who are fighting to defend themselves. After all, Sunni Iraqis were willing to ally with al-Qaida when they felt desperate enough, but when America gave them a better alternative, they turned their guns on al-Qaida. Why should it be different in Syria?

Another objection to providing military assistance to the Syrian opposition is that the conflict has become a sectarian civil war and our intervention would enable the Sunni majority to take a bloody and indiscriminate revenge against the Alawite minority. This is a serious and legitimate concern, and it is only growing worse the longer the conflict goes on. As we saw in Iraq or Lebanon before it, time favors the hard-liners in a conflict such as this. The suffering of Sunnis at the hands of Asad only stokes the temptation for revenge, which in turn only deepens fears among the Alawites and strengthens their incentive to keep fighting. For this reason alone, it is all the more compelling to find a way to end the bloodshed as soon as possible.

Furthermore, the risks of sectarian conflict will exist in Syria whether or not we get more involved. And we will at least have some ability to try to mitigate these risks if we work to assist the armed opposition now. That will at least help us to know them better and to establish some trust and exercise some influence with them, because we took their side when they needed it most. We should not overstate the potential influence we could gain with opposition groups inside Syria, but it will only diminish the longer we wait to offer them meaningful support. And what we can say for certain is we will have no influence whatsoever with these people if they feel we abandoned them. This is a real moral dilemma, but we cannot allow the opposition in Syria to be crushed at present while we worry about the future.

We also hear it said, including by the administration, that we should not contribute to the militarization of the conflict. If only Russia and Iran shared that sentiment. Instead, they are shamelessly fueling Asad's killing machine. We need to deal with reality as it is, not as we wish it to be. And the reality in Syria today is largely a one-sided fight where the aggressors are not lacking for military means and zeal. Indeed, Asad appears to be fully committed to crushing the opposition at all costs. Iran and Russia appear to be fully committed to helping him do it.

The many Syrians who have taken up arms to defend themselves and their communities appear to be fully committed to acquiring the necessary weapons to resist Asad, and leading

Arab States appear increasingly committed to providing those weapons. The only ones who seem overly concerned about a militarization of the conflict is the United States and some of its allies. The time has come to ask a different question: Whom do we want to win in Syria—our friends or our enemies?

There are always plenty of reasons not to do something, and we can list them clearly in the case of Syria. We know the opposition is divided. We know the armed resistance inside the country lacks cohesion or command and control. We know some elements of the opposition may sympathize with violent extremist ideologies or harbor dark thoughts of sectarian revenge. We know many of Syria's immediate neighbors remain cautious about taking overly provocative actions that could undermine Assad. And we know the American people are weary of conflict—justifiably so—and we would rather focus on domestic problems.

These are realities. But while we are compelled to acknowledge them, we are not condemned to accept them forever. With resolve, principled leadership, and wise policy, we can shape better realities. That is what the Syrian people have done.

By no rational calculation should this uprising against Assad still be going on. The Syrian people are outmatched. They are outgunned. They are lacking for food and water and other basic needs. They are confronting a regime with limitless disregard for human dignity and capacity for sheer savagery. For an entire year, the Syrian people have faced death and those unspeakable things worse than death, and they still have not given up. Still they take to the streets to protest peacefully for justice, still they carry on their fight, and they do so on behalf of many of the same universal values we share and many of the same interests as well. These people are our allies. They want many of the same things we do. They have expanded the boundaries of what everyone thought was possible in Syria. They have earned our respect, and now they need our support to finish what they started. The Syrian people deserve to succeed, and shame on us if we fail to help them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COONS). The Senator from Illinois.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask to speak in morning business.

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

TORNADO DAMAGE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there are life experiences that come along with growing up depending on one's family and where they grew up. In my part of the world, part of the Midwest, there was a rite of passage that seemed so commonplace that we never questioned it. It was the air raid siren going off in the middle of the night and your dad would come into your room and say: We have to go down to the basement; there is a tornado warning.

That was part of my life. I didn't think twice about it. It happened every year—sometimes not in the middle of the night, sometimes in the middle of the day, but we became accustomed to it because that is what happened where we lived.

When I was elected to Congress and then to the Senate, I spent my time visiting locations all over my State where tornadoes had struck. So I have seen my fair share of tornado damage in the Midwest, but I have to tell you what I saw on Saturday was extraordinary. I went to southern Illinois to two towns, Harrisburg and Ridgway. They were hit the previous Wednesday by what is known as a stage 4 tornado. A stage 4 tornado is a tornado with winds up to 175 miles per hour. That is a tornado so violent that the winds, from what I am told, were even greater than those of Hurricane Katrina. It hit this tiny little town in southern Illinois, and I looked at the devastation afterward. We expect obvious casualties in a tornado. We expect to see the trees blown down and the siding off the house and the shingles torn off the roof and occasionally a window blown in. One looked at the poor mobile homes, which don't have a chance in a tornado, and they are usually ripped and thrown. But in this tornado, houses that were built on a slab were lifted off and tossed in the air.

I met a lady who was driving away from the devastation of her home—incidentally, these photos are fairly indicative of what we saw in the devastation—and I asked her about her experience. It turned out she was very lucky because she had set the alarm for quarter of 5 to go to work that morning. She said she got up and started getting ready and heard the sirens outside. She said: I went to the bathroom, got down face first on the floor, and grabbed the sink to hang on to it. She said seconds passed before the ceiling caved in on top of her. Luckily, she said it didn't reach her; it pinned her underneath. She said she waited and waited and 15, 20 minutes later somebody started hollering: Is anybody in there? She said she hollered back and they told her: Keep talking. We are going to get you out of there. She escaped with a few scratches and bruises. She was one of the lucky ones. Two of the homes across the street had been blown on top of hers. It turned out across the street a 22-year-old nurse at the local hospital had been killed by the same tornado.

I have never seen this kind of tornado and this kind of damage in my

life. I am told it happened one time before in the history of our State. I also have to tell you the response of the people there makes me proud to be from that State and to be a part of this great Nation. From the very minute this devastation took place, people started coming toward the devastation to try to help. There were some amazing stories such as the volunteers who helped this lady out of the debris of her home. At the nearby coal mine, they have a rescue team that is sent in when there is danger of a mine disaster. They have hard hats and breathing equipment and all the right extraction devices and tools. They came rushing to the scene, coal dust all over their faces, digging right into the wreckage pulling people out. That story was repeated over and over.

The heroism and voluntarism didn't end that day. It continued all through the time I was there and even to this day. Special kudos to the American Red Cross, always the first on the scene, always performing a valuable and important job as they did in southern Illinois.

I went over to Ridgway, which is a town 24 miles away, and for some reason this God-awful tornado skipped from Harrisburg to Ridgway and did little damage in between. But it came down in Ridgway and ripped through that town. Roughly 400 homes were damaged in Harrisburg and over 100 in Ridgway. There is a Catholic Church there over 100 years old. It was the sturdiest structure in town by far. Had people been given enough notice—this happened early in the morning at about 5 a.m.—they might have said the safest place to go is the church. The church is gone. There are two things left, the doorway for the church and the altar. Everything else has been obliterated. There have been a lot of pictures taken of that altar still standing in the rubble, an inspiration to many. Perhaps a message there will be certain things spared even in the worst disasters.

In that town, the fire department met with the mayor and all the volunteers. The one thing about being a volunteer after a disaster in Illinois, I guarantee you will not lose weight. Everybody brought in food, all kinds of food from every direction—pies, cakes, chili, and hot dogs. A fellow came by there and had his barbecue operation set up. It was a huge operation, and he was just cooking like crazy. It was an indication that everybody wanted to pitch in to help. So I wish to thank all those engaged in the rescue and clean-up work at every level.

John Monken, director of the Illinois Emergency Management Agency under Pat Quinn—the Governor has been down there twice—accompanied me on this trip, local units of the government, the sheriff's office, the local disaster agency people, all the volunteers, the Red Cross, a group called Operation Blessing, which showed up—I had never heard of them before. I bet they have