

Kenny led a life defined by service, courage, and unwavering commitment to the men and women of our Nation's firefighters and emergency medical response teams.

A firefighter right out of high school, Kenny was forced into early retirement because of a midcareer injury, but Kenny couldn't walk away from the cause he loved. For 37 years, he served in elected leadership roles in the International Association of Fire Fighters, including as its president.

Kenny was the longest-serving elected official in the union's history, recipient of the District of Columbia's Silver Medal for Valor, and the IAFF's unofficial press secretary.

He valued service to others and love of community and country, and both of these informed his work as a firefighter and as an organizer.

As I noted at the dedication ceremony naming the IAFF Local 36 building in his honor, his hallmark was a profound care for his local members, their families, and the quality of training needed to keep our communities and firefighters safe.

On behalf of the Congressional Fire Services Caucus leadership, I extend my condolences to his son, Ken Jr.; his sister, Karen Hallman; and his entire family.

Kenny's wife sadly passed away after 61 years of marriage last year, and their beloved daughter, Michelle, who sang so beautifully at the annual Fallen Firefighters Memorial Service that so many Members have attended, lost her battle to cancer in 2020.

May Kenny's memory be a blessing and comfort to all who serve on the fire line and the emergency response teams.

END HUNGER NOW

(Mr. McGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, over the August recess, I had the pleasure of visiting the incredible work being done by Verde Vida at their La Casita site and popup market at an elementary school in the Washington Heights neighborhood of New York City.

Across multiple school-based sites in the city, Verde Vida and their partners work to rescue and repurpose perfectly good but unused fresh produce to distribute to families in need.

Along with my colleague Congressman ADRIANO ESPAILLAT, we got to visit with students participating in summer programming at the Magnet School of Inquiry and Expression.

Students had the opportunity to pick out healthy snacks at La Casita's community fridge and then fill a bag of fresh fruits and veggies to bring home to their families. Seeing the kids' excitement over choosing fun and healthy snacks brought a huge smile to my face.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to be uplifting more innovative models like Verde

Vida that address food waste, promote nutrition and learning, and are rooted in trusted community spaces.

We can and should end hunger now.

RECOGNIZING 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL OF THE ARTS—SAN GABRIEL VALLEY

(Mr. CISNEROS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CISNEROS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the California School of the Arts in the San Gabriel Valley.

Over the past decade, this special institution has inspired so many talented young students in California's 31st District to embrace their creativity and pursue their dreams as artists.

I visited the campus earlier this year and saw firsthand the talent on display. Students here are equally dedicated to academic excellence and mastering the artistic process. It is truly an inspiration to witness.

To the staff and educators, I congratulate them on their 10-year anniversary of setting our California-31 students up with the foundation for success.

Best of luck on the new school year, and I wish them all success in their future academic and creative endeavors.

RECOGNIZING DYCKMAN BASKETBALL

(Mr. ESPAILLAT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon in recognition and honor of the positive impact of Dyckman Basketball and what it has had on the communities of Inwood, Washington Heights, and across Upper Manhattan.

All summer, players and fans from the community descend on the famed court on 204th Street. I may say that the entire city goes there because of its caliber. In the 1980s, Kenny Stevens, Omar Booth, and Michael Jenkins established the Dyckman Tournament, seeing that basketball was a positive outlet for neighborhoods that were in the throes of the crack epidemic.

Sharon Bond and Kenneth Stevens continue to be the leaders of this program. Since then, it has grown tremendously and now is viewed as the premier—not one of the premiers, but the premier—street ball contest program in the country, which draws crowds, sponsors, and talent from across the Nation.

The courts are equally packed and lively during pickup games and exhibition games, which include top talent such as Kyrie Irving, J.R. Smith, and Kevin Durant.

Basketball is integral to the identity and passion of New York's 13th District. We have the Dyckman Tournament and staff to thank for it.

Don't forget: Go Knicks.

HONORING KENT LEE SACK

(Mr. DESAULNIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a friend and a local hero in the San Francisco Bay Area, Dr. Kent Lee Sack, who sadly passed away in June.

Dr. Sack, after completing a family medicine residency at the Contra Costa Regional Medical Center, was drafted into the Navy after his residency, where he served as a Marine Corps surgeon in combat in Vietnam.

Returning to the bay area after his military service, Kent became an early provider of HIV care during the AIDS epidemic and established social services for patients, deeply connected to his patients.

Kent's commitment to social justice led him to leadership roles in the Bay Area Physicians for Human Rights and the Rainbow Community Center in Concord, California.

Kent will be remembered for his compassion and his commitment to equality.

Please join me in honoring this great American and a dear friend, Dr. Sack, for his life of service to our community and our country.

SPEAKING OUT FOR FREEDOM

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to what is happening in Hong Kong, especially to Joshua Wong. As a teenager, he led millions of people to the streets of Hong Kong to speak out for democracy and for freedom in Hong Kong and for the Chinese Government to honor its commitment to the Basic Law, which was the foundation of the transition in 1997 from Great Britain to the Chinese Government having control over Hong Kong.

Speaking out for freedom should not be against the law. Since the Basic Law, the Chinese have passed a security law, which is anything but security. It is a repression law. Under this law, Joshua Wong has pleaded guilty to speaking out for freedom. He said: Yes, I have done that.

He can be sentenced to life for speaking out for freedom.

This House, this Congress, has always been bipartisan in joining together for freedom, whether it is in Hong Kong, whether in Tibet, or wherever in China, and for human rights in China. Let us not forget Joshua Wong at this time and not forget Jimmy Lai at the other end of life. Joshua Wong is a young teenager who is doing this now, or in his early twenties. Jimmy Lai is toward the end of his life in prison.

We must speak out for freedom. We must not let this be ignored. The most horrible form of torture that the Chinese have over these people is to tell them that nobody remembers you or why you are here.

We want to be sure that they know we remember them.

□ 1230

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES TO REQUIRE THAT THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES BE COM- POSED OF NINE JUSTICES

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require that the Supreme Court of the United States be composed of nine justices.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 1

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of its submission for ratification:

“ARTICLE—

“The Supreme Court of the United States shall be composed of nine justices consisting of one chief justice and eight associate justices.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1499, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's job is to tell the American people the truth about the law, even when that truth is unpopular, even when a President doesn't like it, and even when Congress doesn't like it.

That only works if the Court is independent. Alexander Hamilton expressed this in Federalist 78. He explained that the courts must be insulated from the political branches or they cannot do their job of protecting the rights of the people.

Disagreeing with the Supreme Court is not just legitimate. It is American. We amend the Constitution, or we pass new laws. We elect Presidents who appoint different judges. That is how you change outcomes you don't like. That is the process the Founders gave us. But there is a world of difference between changing the law and changing the rules of the game because you don't like the last call.

Packing the Court is not simply a policy disagreement. It is an attempt to change the structure of one of the three branches of government in order to guarantee the outcome you want.

That is not reform. That is revolution.

Here is the question every American should ask: If a sitting majority can change the size of the Supreme Court the moment it dislikes rulings, what happens the next time the other side is in power? What stops them from doing the same thing?

As Justice Breyer said, this will start an “arms race.”

Once you go down that road, the Court stops being an independent check on government power. It becomes another political institution controlled by whoever happens to hold the majority.

We have already seen what this kind of rhetoric looks like. In 2020, Senator SCHUMER stood outside the Supreme Court and told Justices Gorsuch and Kavanaugh: “. . . you have unleashed a whirlwind, and you will pay the price.” That was a threat, a threat that goes well beyond any normal policy disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years later, an armed man was arrested outside Justice Kavanaugh's home. Thankfully, law enforcement intervened before anyone was hurt.

Words have consequences, and when political leaders convince people that the Supreme Court is illegitimate, some people take that rhetoric seriously.

Some on the left aren't even hiding where this leads. The Democratic Socialists of America now openly call for abolishing the Senate and replacing the Presidency and the Supreme Court. I am not making that up. That is in their platform.

Seeking to expand the Court is an admission that your arguments have not been good enough to persuade voters or your fellow legislators. We rely on a political process, including robust one-on-one debates, to convince voters that ours are the superior plans.

When you can no longer convince enough voters that you have the best ideas, you have two choices: You can go back to voters with a better argument, or you can try to change the system so their vote doesn't matter as much.

That is why the amendment before us is so important. It fixes the number of Justices at nine permanently. That is not because nine is a magic number. It is because a fixed Court cannot be expanded by whoever happens to win the next election. It makes the rule the same regardless of who is in power.

To my friends on the other side of the aisle: We don't have to like every decision the Supreme Court makes. Heaven knows there are plenty of decisions I have disagreed with. That is not the point. The point is whether we are willing to live under a Constitution that limits our power even when we are the ones holding it.

If we want to change the law, we can change the law, but we should not change the Supreme Court simply because we don't like the people sitting on it.

Constitutional government requires accepting outcomes we don't like and fighting for change the right way: through elections, through legislation, and through the amendment process this very body is using today.

Let's keep the Supreme Court independent. Let's keep it at nine Justices, and let's keep the Constitution bigger than whoever happens to be in power.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In this 119th Congress we have watched the President's followers in Congress surrender to the President one constitutional power after another.

Amazingly, the Speaker and the MAGA party have abdicated nearly every single essential power that the Framers exclusively vested in us, Congress, the Representatives of the people. First is the power to declare war, which has been usurped by the President with catastrophic results for the country and without a peep from his sycophants in Congress.

Next is the spending power, the power of the purse, the power to appropriate Federal dollars to spending and grant programs and to specify their purposes, powers that have been continually violated in acts of impoundment, nullification, and redirection by the President who has not only effectively shut down the Department of Education, USAID, and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, but has even helped himself, without any appropriation from Congress, to \$1.8 billion of taxpayer money to give away to Proud Boys, Oath Keepers, and other convicted insurrectionists who attacked this body in order to try to overthrow a Presidential election in January of 2021;

Next is the power to impose tariffs and taxes and the power to regulate