

I also ask unanimous consent that an article on the life and service of Mr. Jack Sizemore that appeared in the Laurel County-area publication the Sentinel Echo be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the following article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sentinel Echo, February 15, 2013]

FORMER JAILER REMEMBERED AS 'GOOD MAN'

(By Nita Johnson)

LAUREL COUNTY, KENTUCKY.—A former Laurel County jailer, chief administrator of the jail, and deputy sheriff was laid to rest on Tuesday after ongoing health problems.

Jack Sizemore, 76, died Saturday at his home from frontotemporal dementia, which left him unable to communicate with others. Sizemore left a legacy of goodwill for his family, friends and co-workers.

Edd Parsley worked with Sizemore after Parsley was appointed as jailer in 1997. Sizemore stayed on as chief administrator of the Laurel County Detention Center when Parsley was elected to a four-year term as jailer.

"Jack worked for me for six years as chief administrator of the jail, and he was one of those people that if you told him to do something, you could very well rest assured that he would carry it out," Parsley said. "He liked the job he was doing and he took care of the prisoners in a humane way and with the utmost courtesy. You don't find many men like that."

Describing Sizemore as "a good man," Parsley reviewed Sizemore's background that made him invaluable at the jail.

"He was experienced in law enforcement. He was a deputy under several sheriffs," Parsley said. "He realized what had to be done and did it. He served this county well as a jailer, chief administrator and deputy."

Barb Rudder, who has worked in the booking department of the jail for nearly 20 years, said Sizemore was "a good person to work with."

"He always used to have people laughing and he would tell everyone that I was his babysitter."

After Sizemore retired, Rudder said she visited him during his illness the past two years.

"It's a sad loss for the community and for his family," she said.

That loss is indeed sad for Madgel Miller, who was one of Sizemore's stepchildren.

"Jack was my stepdad, but we didn't use 'step' in our family," Miller said. "He had seven kids, 20 grandchildren, 16 great-grandchildren, some of whom were step. But step was never considered in the family."

Sizemore faced several health issues during the latter part of his life, Miller said, including a quadruple bypass in 2008.

"But he came through that very well and since he did, we were expecting him to have a long retirement."

But other health problems came with the frontotemporal dementia, which affects one's communication skills.

"It is a rare form of dementia, but he and my mother never had a problem communicating," she said. "He loved my mother unconditionally, and they had their own form of communicating."

But the past several months had taken its toll on the former jailer, and Miller said by Christmas, Sizemore was very ill.

"He had a rapid decline from it [dementia]. Last week, he had a real hard time of it, and my mother made a doctor's appointment for him," Miller added. "He was in the hospital Wednesday because the doctor said he was

weak and dehydrated. But he was able to walk in the hospital. He went home Friday and had a good night with family, and some friends came over. He couldn't communicate with us. He died in his sleep that night, with Mom and me beside him."

Choking back tears, Miller described Sizemore as a man with "a good heart" who was also "very intelligent."

Miller said many people had come to tell the family how Sizemore had touched their lives.

"It was good to hear people say, 'Let me tell you what Jack Sizemore did for me,' and it was stories that he never told. Jack was always telling stories, but these were about what he did for people," Miller said. "I remember when I was going to college, he would tell me, 'This is a good place to raise kids. This is a good place to live.' He loved this town."

Hearing the impact that her father had had on the people he dealt with during his lifetime, Miller said her opinion of Sizemore's goodwill towards others was reinforced.

"He was a very private person and didn't tell people about the dementia," she said. "He knew how to handle people and how to keep his own life private and personal. We made the arrangements quickly because he would rather be remembered in better times. Knowing Jack Sizemore, he would have had it no other way."

SHELBY COUNTY V. HOLDER

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, in 2005, I was honored to join Congressman JOHN LEWIS on a trip to Selma, AL, for a ceremonial walk over the Edmund Pettus Bridge to mark the 40th anniversary of what has come to be known as "Bloody Sunday."

In March of 1965, Congressman LEWIS, Rev. Hosea Williams, and 600 other brave civil rights activists led a voting rights march over that bridge.

These courageous men, women, and children were marching for civil rights and voting rights. All they would receive that day, however, were beatings and bruises from police batons as they were turned back and chased down by State troopers.

A few days after "Bloody Sunday," President Johnson addressed the Nation and called on the House and the Senate to pass the Voting Rights Act.

Shortly thereafter, the Voting Rights Act was signed into law, guaranteeing that the fundamental right to vote would never again be canceled out by clever schemes—like poll taxes and literacy tests—devised to keep African Americans from voting.

The Voting Rights Act is the cornerstone of the civil rights movement and one of the most effective laws on the books when it comes to protecting the right to vote for all Americans.

On Wednesday, the Supreme Court heard oral arguments in *Shelby County v. Holder*, a case challenging the constitutionality of section 5, which is the very heart of the Voting Rights Act.

That section requires jurisdictions in all or part of 16 States with a history of discrimination to get approval from the Department of Justice or a Federal court before making any changes to congressional districts or voting procedures.

This is not the first time that the Supreme Court has heard a challenge to the Voting Rights Act. Though it has been subject to four prior Supreme Court challenges, the Voting Rights Act has always emerged intact and on sound legal and constitutional ground.

Each of the four times that the Voting Rights Act has been reauthorized—in 1970, 1975, 1982, and most recently in 2006—Congress has done so with the broad bipartisan support and overwhelming majorities that are all too rare these days.

That is because protecting the right to vote should not be a partisan prerogative. It is not a Democratic or Republican issue. It is a fundamental right for every eligible voter, and it is a core value of our American democracy.

In 2006, the House of Representatives voted 390 to 33 in favor of reauthorizing the law. The Senate voted unanimously, 98 to 0, to reauthorize the law. And the final bill was signed into law by President George W. Bush.

There was good reason for this bipartisan support for reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act. Congress developed an extensive record, holding 21 hearings, reviewing more than 15,000 pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and hearing from more than 90 witnesses about the need to reauthorize the law.

Conservative Republican Congressman JIM SENSENBRENNER is one example. Congressman SENSENBRENNER was the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee when Congress reauthorized the Voting Rights Act. He strongly believes that section 5 is constitutional, and he has filed a brief asking the Supreme Court to uphold the law.

My hope is that the Supreme Court will look at the extensive evidence Congress reviewed in 2006 and defer to the judgment of an overwhelming majority of the House and a unanimous Senate.

The Court should affirm the constitutionality of this critical tool for protecting the right to vote.

We all acknowledge the progress that our great country has made on civil rights and voting rights issues. The current occupant of 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., is a symbol and timely reminder that our Nation has indeed grown to be more perfect—and more inclusive in many ways—than just a few generations ago.

We are not yet, however, a perfect union. And some of the jurisdictions covered by the Voting Rights Act have both a demonstrated history and a contemporary record of implementing discriminatory restrictions on voting.

The Voting Rights Act has been essential in securing the progress we have made as a nation over the last five decades.

And as my Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights found during a series of hearings last Congress, the Voting Rights Act remains a relevant and critical tool in protecting the right to vote.

After a careful analysis of new voter ID laws in Texas and South Carolina, the Department of Justice used its authority under section 5 of the Voting Rights Act to object to the implementation of new photo identification requirements.

In Texas, according to the State's own data, more than 790,000 registered voters did not have the ID required to vote under the new Texas law.

That law would have had a disproportionate impact on Latino voters because 38.2 percent of registered Hispanic voters did not have the type of ID required by the law.

In South Carolina, the State's own data indicated that almost 240,000 registered voters did not have the identification required to vote under the State's new law.

That included 10 percent of all registered minorities in South Carolina who would not be able to vote under the new law.

That is more than 1 million registered voters who would have been turned away from the polls in Texas and South Carolina if the Department of Justice did not have the authority to object to those photo identification laws under the Voting Rights Act.

Opponents of the Voting Rights Act claim that some of the jurisdictions covered by the law should no longer be subject to it.

They rarely mention, however, that the Voting Rights Act itself contains a provision allowing jurisdictions to "bail out" or be excused from coverage under the law if they demonstrate compliance with the law for the previous 10 years.

In 2006, the Supreme Court clarified and expanded this bailout provision.

As a result, more than 190 jurisdictions have bailed out of coverage under the Voting Rights Act. The fact that so many jurisdictions have been excused from coverage under the law proves two very important points.

First, the Voting Rights Act is having its intended effect. States and localities that previously had a record of discriminating against minority voters are no longer doing so thanks to the scrutiny of the Voting Rights Act.

Second, the Voting Rights Act is not over-inclusive. Jurisdictions that can prove they are not discriminating—over a reasonable period of time—will be excused from coverage under the law.

The Voting Rights Act is not about who wins an election. It is not about political advantage. It is about ensuring that every eligible American can vote and that their vote will be counted.

As long as there continues to be evidence that some people are being denied the right to vote, we have an obligation to remedy that problem.

The Voting Rights Act has done its job of protecting the right to vote for almost 50 years. Congress did its job in 2006 by developing an extensive record and reauthorizing the law in an overwhelming and bipartisan manner.

It is my hope the Supreme Court will now do its job and affirm the constitutionality of this critical law.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS TORNADO ONE-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this week marks the 1-year anniversary of the deadly tornado that devastated the towns of Harrisburg and Ridgway in Saline and Gallatin Counties.

I visited both of those towns right after the tornado.

I have seen my fair share of tornado damage in my life. But when I visited Harrisburg and Ridgway, I saw some things I have never seen before. I expected to see some trees blown down and shingles torn off roofs. Instead, I saw entire houses lifted from their concrete foundation and tossed on top of the neighboring house.

The loss of homes and property was really difficult to bear, but the real tragedy lies in the lives that were claimed by this tornado. Eight people died as a result of this violent storm: Randy Rann, Donna Rann, Jaylynn Ferrell, Mary Osman, Linda Hull, Greg Swierk, Don Smith and R. Blaine Mauney.

But despite this incredible loss, when I visited Harrisburg and Ridgway, what I didn't see were broken spirits. Instead, from the very minute this disaster took place, people came together to rebuild the community. The outpouring of support was amazing almost 6,000 people pitched in before it was all over.

And I can't say enough about the tireless efforts the emergency personnel who were there from the minute that the sirens went off. They were there to help under the most extraordinary circumstances.

I went to Harrisburg 5 weeks after my first visit and I was amazed at how much better the community looked.

Today, both communities have made incredible progress moving forward, thanks again to everyone engaged in the rescue and cleanup at every level, and during this entire past year.

I also want to recognize the hard work and dedication of: Jonathan Monken, head of the Illinois Emergency Management Agency; Eric Gregg, Mayor of Harrisburg; Becky Mitchell, Mayor of Ridgway; State Senator Gary Forby; and State Representative Brandon Phelps. They were there when their constituents and their communities needed them the most.

Today, when I see how much the residents of Harrisburg and Ridgway have done to rebuild their communities over the past year, I am proud to be from Illinois and proud to be part of this great Nation.

TRIBUTE TO DIANNE JONES

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to a friend and exceptional Illinoisan who recently passed away.

In 1949, a young woman from New York moved to Chicago to attend college at Roosevelt University. Her name was Dianne Jones, and she stayed for the next 63 years.

After graduating from Roosevelt, Dianne decided she wanted to teach, and she began planting her roots in the civil rights and labor communities. Along with her husband Linzey, she fought for civil rights and equality by helping to organize two Chicago-area chapters of the NAACP. Dianne then led the successful effort to desegregate the city's Rainbow Beach, and she even attended the 1963 March on Washington where Martin Luther King, Jr. delivered his famous "I Have a Dream" speech.

As a teacher, Dianne established herself as an advocate for educators and children by helping to found one of the first teachers unions in Illinois. She later served as that union's local president, as well as vice president of the Illinois Federation of Teachers. As a teacher and an advocate, Dianne spent her life fighting to promote equality, justice, civil rights and education in Illinois. And she enjoyed it.

Once, when asked about her career, Dianne said, "Everyone should get to work at what they would volunteer to do."

Dianne Jones was one of the lucky people who got to do just that. Those roots that she planted 50 years ago have continued to grow and multiply ever since.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, the Senate Appropriations Committee has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 113th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on behalf of myself and Senator SHELBY, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE RULES—113TH CONGRESS

I. MEETINGS

The Committee will meet at the call of the Chairman.

II. QUORUMS

1. Reporting a bill. A majority of the members must be present for the reporting of a bill.

2. Other business. For the purpose of transacting business other than reporting a bill or taking testimony, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

3. Taking testimony. For the purpose of taking testimony, other than sworn testimony, by the Committee or any subcommittee, one member of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum. For the purpose of taking sworn testimony by the Committee, three members shall constitute a quorum, and for the taking of