

from being open and welcoming to all irrespective of individual characteristics and background.

The Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession, a new group with a promising approach to diversity and inclusion in the legal profession, was established in Chicago, Illinois, in September 2009.

The Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession is addressing the contrast between the increasingly diverse society in which we live and what certainly appears to be an entrenched lack of diversity and inclusion. The Institute is working to improve diversity and promote inclusion through comprehensive outreach and innovative programs.

For example, the Institute asks hard questions and finds the answers to them. Working with legal, judicial, professional, educational, and governmental institutions, the Institute provides programs and tools to promote equity in the legal field. IILP uses a new and, in many ways, unique approach. Its comprehensive programs include lawyers, judges, and law students to address all facets, all practice settings, and all types of diversity within the legal profession. Beyond working to overcome the barriers facing diverse lawyers, it looks at the pipeline for new legal talent. This aspect is key. By helping diverse students become law students, enter the legal profession, and eventually become successful lawyers and judges, the profession will become more diverse and inclusive.

A few examples of the work of the Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession include a pledge to the profession where lawyers across the country are being asked to dedicate a minimum of 1 day of service to work with young people to educate them about the legal profession and encourage them to join it; Professionalism in Practice, a program where law students and judges learn from each other about the profession and, in doing so, about diversity and inclusion; the "Business Case for Diversity: Reality or Wishful Thinking?" a research project that provides the first hard data examining the impact of the business case for diversity and the state of diversity; and, "The State of Diversity and Inclusion in the Legal Profession," which is an annual report and series of symposia designed to educate the bar about its current state, cutting-edge issues surrounding diversity and inclusion and the most promising programs, efforts, and initiatives aimed at making entry into and success within the legal profession more accessible to all.

The mission and work of the IILP is an important contribution to social justice in the United States. I consider it an honor to recognize the Institute for Inclusion in the Legal Profession and invite all Members to join me in recognizing them for the importance of their mission and the great work they are undertaking.

H.R. 71

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. We have had a very challenging week, Madam Speaker, and I thank you for the time.

It is a time of great patriotism and great respect for the institutions of democracy that this country represents. It is a statement that says that we will not be an offender, but we will be a defender. We will defend our values; we will defend our soil; we will defend the people of the United States.

I have served on the Homeland Security Committee as the dust was rising from the site of 9/11. When I traveled to New York, I walked along sidewalks where there were walls of letters and pictures of loved ones who had not been designated as being lost and people were trying to see if loved ones were in hospitals. I saw the pain. And so the capturing and the demise of Osama bin Laden is the finishing of an era and a story. And we are to commend the President of the United States, the Navy SEALs, the JSOC and intelligence communities, and the United States military and persons around this Nation who are part of this great effort.

Well, we live in a different world now. As the facts are unfolding in Pakistan, as evidence has been reviewed by the various tapes, we know that terrorism and al Qaeda is an active entity around the world. The United States is not the only target, but we are and will continue to be in the eye of the storm.

As we have heard representations from terrorists and to-be leaders and wanna-bes about what they intend to do to retaliate, it is important for us to be responsible with the resources that we have. And so for over a year I have introduced H.R. 71, the FAMS Augmentation bill, the Federal Air Marshal. And I call on, today, for the administration and the Congress to work together to increase the number of air marshals on domestic flights, on long-distance flights, and to increase the numbers of air marshals traveling on inbound flights to the United States. What more do we need?

Over the last couple of days, any series of incidents that have occurred, and thanks to the brave passengers now well aware since 9/11 and flight attendants for whom I have fought consistently to get more training, unarmed, obviously, and many without training, are now being confronted with individuals who are charging now reinforced pilot doors, some going to the exit doors, over the last 4 days a series of incidents that no one knows whether or not they will stop.

Now, we know that some allegations have been that individuals are suffering from mental challenges, and we understand that. We also know that, to date, no one had a weapon, and so the Transportation Security Administra-

tion is doing its job. But this is happening. That is what air marshals are for: to protect the traveling public, flying more than they have ever flown, paying higher prices for bags and food, and now we expect them not to be safe and secure. It is time now to augment and to pass H.R. 71 and to increase the number of air marshals.

Now, we have an issue of a deficit and a debt. My question is, as someone would say: Are we going to be penny-wise and pound-foolish? Are we going to not safeguard the American people because there happens to be the mantra on this side of the aisle, Republicans, who don't want to spend a dime for anything? Well, my friends, we have to invest in the American public. We have got to be able to build infrastructure, and at the same time we have got to be responsible spenders.

But I will tell you this. I will take spending for national security any day with bringing home the troops from Afghanistan, because that mission is complete. Now we must invest in American people. And I'm angry about this, that we would be so cheap that we would not provide the resources to give us new and additional trained Federal air marshals, many of whom come from the United States military. Many of these soldiers coming home would make excellent air marshals.

□ 1040

Many of them come from the U.S. Marshals Service and many other marshals services.

What is more precious than the mother and father and children and relatives that are traveling to visit loved ones or for business, and they are coming home to the United States and we are putting them in jeopardy because we do not have the air marshals to protect them against these unknown threats?

So my challenge today is stop being cheap, stop nickel-and-diming security, stop not understanding that we have the responsibility to go ahead and secure the American public. Today I call for more air marshals on the Nation's airplanes, and I call for it now. H.R. 71 should be passed immediately.

PUERTO RICO'S COMEBACK STORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Madam Speaker, the United States stands at a crossroads. Responsible leaders recognize that a bipartisan fiscal strategy must be crafted to reduce deficits. A deal will require courage on the part of its proponents, because each revenue raiser and spending cut is bound to trigger opposition.

Unless officials can persuade voters that sacrifice and self-restraint now are essential for stability and strength later, a deal will not happen. Even with public buy-in, leaders must be ready to

take action, despite the political perils, and be prepared to raise the national interest above their personal interests and reelection. It will not be easy, but it must be done.

For officials in Washington who are in search of a comeback story, I suggest the case of Puerto Rico. In January 2009, the U.S. territory stood on the brink of disaster. The new government had inherited a deficit of \$3.3 billion. As a percentage of revenue, this was the largest deficit of any U.S. administration. The new administration was even forced to take a loan to meet its first payroll. Major rating agencies had downgraded Puerto Rico's credit to near junk status. Simply put, the island's economy was about to implode.

Leaders in San Juan faced a stark choice. Like their predecessors, they could usher Puerto Rico down this unsustainable path, paralyzed by the fear that tough choices would antagonize voters; or they could place their responsibility to protect Puerto Rico's future above their desire to preserve their poll numbers.

Fortunately for Puerto Rico, the new leadership chose the right course. For 2-plus years, Governor Luis Fortuno and the island's legislature have taken decisive action to impose fiscal discipline and create a leaner, more responsible government. They have cut government spending by nearly 20 percent, sharply reducing the deficit as a percentage of revenue. Indeed, by this metric, the island has moved from last in the Nation to a fiscal position that is better than 30 States. The rating agencies have rewarded Puerto Rico's progress, with Moody's giving the island its highest rating in 35 years.

To achieve savings, the government cut expenses and political appointments and was compelled to reduce its payroll. In my experience, rational leaders do not lay off workers because they think this will play to their political advantage. To the contrary, few actions are likely to arouse greater public displeasure. After all, work does more than put bread on the family table. It gives men and women dignity and a sense of purpose. But the Government of Puerto Rico's actions were absolutely necessary and were taken despite serious political risks.

Measures were taken to cushion the blow for those workers who were let go, and layoffs did not include teachers or first responders. More importantly, the government factions prevented an economic disaster, which would have resulted in far greater suffering and job loss.

It is important to emphasize that these decisions were not partisan. Governor Fortuno is a Republican and I, as Puerto Rico's only Representative in Congress, am a proud Democrat, and I supported his policies. The island legislators who voted to advance this agenda are affiliated with both national parties. And unlike in some States, Puerto Rico's leaders did not politicize ARRA or other Federal funding which

served as a lifeline for the island. Rather, they have worked to put every dollar to good use.

So for leaders in Washington who say it will be impossible to achieve bipartisanship in the budget debate, the case of Puerto Rico should provide a measure of hope. As it nurses the economy back to health, the Puerto Rico Government is also advancing a long-term, pro-growth strategy. For example, the government has reduced individual and corporate tax rates and ensured that everyone contributes their fair share; boosted sales of housing and commercial properties through other incentives; and worked to address Puerto Rico's high energy costs and dependence on foreign oil, including through the development of a natural gas pipeline that will create thousands of jobs, lower carbon emissions and significantly reduce energy bills for individuals and companies on the island.

In closing, Puerto Rico's leadership has proven that it is possible to work across party lines to control spending and create growth. I urge my colleagues in this Chamber to work in this same spirit and to set aside partisan differences to secure the long-term fiscal health of the country we love.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Wallace Shepherd, Second Baptist Church, Santa Barbara, California, offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we bless You, Lord, in this season, while our homeland faces difficult decisions and conflicts across many nations.

We bow before You this day, requesting Your mercy and Your grace. Grant this Congress Your guidance as they work collectively as one. We pray, dear Lord, as resolutions are prepared, that there will be a united commitment to the development of comprehensive laws.

Lead this Congress and Nation in the direction of tranquility that reflects the intent of our forefathers. Endow us as a Nation to be humble, as we transcend the norm, without forgetting those that are in need. Anchor our hearts with prudence, as we consider the development of our youth. Protect our troops, as they fight for democracy and freedom throughout the world.

Steer us on the path of righteousness with temperance. Bless our government, and bless this Nation.

In Jesus Christ's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. ELLMERS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND WALLACE SHEPHERD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a valued constituent and a good friend, Dr. Wallace Shepherd.

Dr. Shepherd came to the Second Baptist Church of Santa Barbara as pastor in 2006. Since then, Pastor Shepherd has reestablished Santa Barbara's Martin Luther King Day event as a capstone celebration on the central coast of California.

He is an active board member of the Endowment for Youth program, which supports the education of underprivileged children through tutoring and scholarships. Dr. Shepherd also helped to found Eco Faith, a nonprofit organization that promotes conservation of energy in churches and houses of worship.

He has been appointed evangelism director of the Central District of California, and also the vice president of the Third Sunday Fellowship for Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties. But as our House has just witnessed, he is at the core a powerful presence and a humble servant in the name of his faith.

I am honored to welcome him here to Congress, and thank him for his invaluable service to our community and to our country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.