

What is at stake here is of extreme significance. Established in the founding of our Nation and sustained for over 200 years, religious freedom is at the very core of our system of government, and protection of religious liberty means all people of all faiths have the right to exercise their faith within the bounds of our justice system even if their belief seems to some as misguided or flawed or flatout wrong. But what is unique about America and what is guaranteed in our Constitution is that we do not have the right to dictate to those people how to express their faith so long as they are within the bounds of justice, how to express their faith, live their faith, and employ their faith.

Taking that right away from faith-based institutions is flatout wrong and I believe a violation of the most precious amendment to the Constitution. Faith-based institutions should not have to facilitate insurance coverage for products that are counter to their religious or moral beliefs. To require them to betray the fundamental tenets of their beliefs and accept this violation of their First Amendment rights guaranteed by the Constitution is simply wrong.

In a joint statement released shortly after announcement of the Hobby Lobby decision, Archbishop Joseph Kurtz, president of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, and Archbishop William Lori of Baltimore, chairman of the U.S. Bishops Ad Hoc Committee for Religious Liberty, said:

Now is the time to redouble our effort to build a culture that fully respects religious freedom.

That is really what we are asking for. We are asking this administration to respect those institutions' and those individuals' religious freedom as guaranteed under our Constitution. Whether we agree with their tenets, whether we ideologically take a position in favor or not in favor, it is their right and it is guaranteed.

I hope in the coming days the Supreme Court will strike down the administration's mandate for all faith-based institutions and rescind this unprecedented attack on religious freedom. While we await further action from the Court, now is the time for this body—the Senate—and all Americans of faith to stand for our country's longstanding right to the freedom of religion. It was the father of our country, after all, George Washington, who once said:

I have often expressed my sentiment, that every man, conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshipping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience.

We today know that reference to "every man" also includes every woman and every human being, the right to be accountable to God alone for their religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshipping the Deity according to the dictates of their own

conscience—not the dictates of a Federal Government that says "We know better," nor the dictates of those who simply say "We will interpret that liberty to our satisfaction to accomplish our purposes." As in Washington's times, we must defend these rights of conscience and preserve religious liberty for all Americans regardless of their choice of belief and expression of their faith.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, last week Target stores announced that they were going to initiate a new policy in their stores across the country. They were going to politely ask all of their consumers to refrain from bringing guns inside their stores.

This is a picture of one of their customers bringing what appears to be a semiautomatic rifle into a store in order to buy Oreos. Their statement read like this:

As you have likely seen in the media, there has been debate about whether guests in communities that permit "open carry" should be allowed to bring firearms into Target stores. Our approach has always been to follow local laws, and of course we will continue to do so, but starting today we will also respectfully request that guests not bring firearms to Target—even in communities where it is permitted by law.

We've listened carefully to the nuances of this debate and respect the protected rights of everyone involved. . . . This is a complicated issue, but it boils down to a simple belief: Bringing firearms to Target creates an environment that is at odds with the family-friendly shopping and work experience we strive to create.

I am thankful that Target has taken this position. I am hopeful that other retail stores across the country will follow suit. My only point of disagreement is that there is any nuance to this debate. My only point of contention is that there is anything complicated about whether this is appropriate for workers across retail stores and restaurants in the United States or the little kids who come in and shop there on a regular basis.

Here is what the NRA had to say about this. The NRA released a statement that said:

Let's not mince words, not only is it rare, it is downright weird and certainly not a practical way to normally go about your business while being prepared to defend yourself—talking about bringing firearms into stores—to those who are not acquainted with the dubious practice of using public displays of firearms as a means to draw attention to one's self or one's cause, it can be down right scary. Using guns really to draw

attention to yourself in public not only defies common sense, it shows a lack of consideration and manners.

That was the NRA's position for a couple of days, until a handful of NRA members got upset and started tearing up their membership cards, and then the NRA's top lobbyist apologized for that statement and effectively withdrew it. Luckily, Target some weeks later changed their policies.

That is weird. That is scary. That is inappropriate. It is this policy which we have perpetuated by our inaction in this place that allows for the continued diffusion of weapons, many of which are military grade such as the one displayed here that is leading to the spiraling rates of mass gun violence across this country.

We went for a stretch in January or February where there was a school shooting almost every other day that school was open. We expect now to pick up the newspaper and read about another mass slaughter somewhere in this country, and we wonder why it is happening. There are guys buying Oreos with an assault rifle strapped onto their shoulder, and that debate is nuanced and complicated about whether we should allow it.

The gun lobby's position speaks to this mythology—that is charitable, a lie to the cynics—that the only way to stop a bad guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun. That is not what actually any of the data tells us. The data tells us if you have a gun in your home, you are much more likely to be the victim of a gunshot from that gun than you are to ever use that on an assailant. If you are a woman, for instance, you are five times more likely to die as a result of domestic violence with a gun if it is in your home rather than if you are in a home without a gun. Health Affairs came out with a study of 50 States. A longitudinal study of experience related to rates of gun violence and rates of gun ownership found that for every percentage increase of gun ownership in a community, there is a percentage increase in gun violence.

There have been 79 shootings in Walmarts in the last year—79 shootings in Walmarts, of all places, in the last year. I am glad Target made the decision to take guns out of the workplace.

Senator BLUMENTHAL will speak after me. Senator BLUMENTHAL and I sent a letter to Target asking them to make this change in policy, and I am glad they did.

It appears we will have debate this week on a piece of legislation that will allow for individuals to bring more firearms onto public property throughout this country. It is not a debate about bringing firearms into Target stores; it is a debate about bringing firearms onto public lands.

There is a perfectly legitimate debate to be had about bringing more legal guns onto public property, but there is a more important debate than that about taking illegal guns off of

our city streets. If the Senate is going to spend a week debating a bill about gun policy, then we should be talking about getting rid of illegal guns. We should be talking about keeping guns out of the hands of criminals. We should be talking about stopping the epidemic of gun violence across this country.

These are the numbers: 31,000 people are killed by guns every year, 2,600 people are killed by guns every month, and 86 people are killed by guns every day. If we are going to be talking on the floor of the Senate about guns this week, we should be talking about how to stop another Newtown, another Aurora, another bloody Chicago summer.

The bill we are being asked to debate this week is a gun bill that does nothing to stop the scourge of gun violence across our country, and I for one cannot vote for it. I cannot vote for it because there are not only families still grieving in Newtown, but every single day there are families grieving across this country, such as the families associated with a young man by the name of Michael Mayfield in Baltimore, MD. Michael was killed earlier this year. He was an outstanding student. He was passionate about being a member of the Junior ROTC. He was a gifted baseball star in Baltimore. The paramedics found Michael shot in the head inside a vehicle in Northwest Baltimore and took him to a local hospital, where he died. He left his house at about 6 o'clock, and somebody walked up to him on the street, shot him four times in the head, and then fled on foot to an awaiting car up the street. He had been accepted to college, and he was due to start there this fall, but instead of going to his graduation, his family and friends—hundreds of them—went to his funeral.

Paul Lee was killed some weeks later in another school shooting at Seattle Pacific University. A delusional young man started shooting and killed Paul, who was described as easygoing and energetic. A friend and dorm mate of his said he was adored by everyone and affectionate with everybody. He loved to dance. He was a member of Seattle Pacific University's hip-hop club, and his friend said he would walk around his dorm doing the robot. At a makeshift memorial to him outside where his funeral took place, one friend wrote, "Keep dancing in heaven."

Kristjan Ndoj, a 15-year-old from Connecticut, was out on his bike one night. When the clock approached 8:45, two gunshots were fired from a wooded area near his house and struck Kristjan in the head and leg, dropping him onto the driveway at Agawam Trail. He died 5 days later. Police say the shooting may have involved trouble over a teenage girl.

The casualness of violence in this country and the idea that a dispute over a teenage girl would result in the death of a 15-year-old is directly connected to our casualness about guns in this country. If we are so casual as to

think someone needs to be armed when they go to buy Oreos at a Target, it stands to reason that some kids may think they can have a casualness about settling disputes with guns as well.

I will not be voting for cloture today because we are long overdue to make a statement in the Senate about the tens of thousands of deaths happening due to guns all across this country. Everyone has a role to play in trying to stem this epidemic of violence. Target has a role to play, and they stepped up last week by taking guns out of their stores. Our hospitals and our mental health professionals have a role to play. This is not just about the number of guns out in our communities, this is also about getting resources to very troubled kids. This Congress has a role to play as well. Our role is to have a debate about how we can take guns out of the hands of criminals, take military-style assault weapons off the streets, and give real resources to people who want to help these troubled individuals. That is the debate we should be having on the floor of the Senate this week if we really want to honor all of the voices of these victims.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I wish to thank my colleague Senator MURPHY. He is my friend and partner on so many different issues but most especially on measures to stop gun violence in this country—commonsense, sensible measures he has championed so ably, and I have been very proud to work with him as a partner in spearheading this issue as well.

I wish to explain my reasons that I am unable to vote for the bill we are considering today, the bill that is presented for cloture on the motion to proceed this afternoon. People in the United States have a Second Amendment right to possess and use firearms. It is guaranteed by the Constitution. And there are legitimate ways people can use firearms in this country—recreational and sometimes commercial. Those rights are guaranteed by the Constitution, and this measure, arguably, is in service of those rights.

I cannot vote for a measure which makes owning or possessing or using guns more readily or easily useable when we have failed to act, and we have failed to act, on commonsense, sensible measures that will stop gun violence.

I voted to achieve cloture on a measure very similar to this one before Sandy Hook and before the Senate failed to produce the necessary 60 votes which were required to pass commonsense gun violence legislation a year ago April.

I can see the legitimate reasons to vote for the Sportsmen's Bill and to support cloture but not when this body has failed in its fundamental obligation to make America safer and to rid it of gun violence. We have an obligation to take first things first and pro-

tect our children and adopt the kinds of commonsense measures—background checks, mental health initiatives, school safety, and a ban on illegal trafficking—that are easily within reach and would be passed by a majority of this body if presented for another vote and if a majority of Members voting was sufficient rather than the 60 votes that is now our threshold.

I am reminded today of a victim of gun violence over this very weekend in the early morning of Sunday. A young woman in Bridgeport was gunned down by her ex-boyfriend, raging into her mother's house. First he shot her mother's boyfriend and then turned his gun on her because she had the audacity to end their relationship.

Her story puts a face on the reason I have offered a measure named after Lori Jackson, another victim of gun violence, to impose commonsense steps to take guns away from the people who are under temporary restraining orders as well as permanent restraining orders. Whether that kind of measure would have worked in this case is irrelevant. Her death was unnecessary, preventable, tragic, and painful to her family, not to mention her mom, who was in the house at the time she was gunned down and murdered.

Her death occurred within 75 minutes of another death in Bridgeport. On the east side, Abraham "A.B." Davidson, a 23-year-old young man, was sitting on his house porch on Barnum Avenue in Bridgeport—gunned down.

In the case of Kiromy Fontanez—the young woman who was shot by her ex-boyfriend—the shooter, Jose Santiago, was apprehended almost immediately and gave a confession. According to Bridgeport police, the case is closed. The chief of the Bridgeport police, Chief Gaudett, had this to say:

Three separate incidents, six people shot, two people dead. I am very proud of the work that all of our officers do every day, but especially last night. It was a really trying night last night.

Chief Gaudett committed himself to begin a renewed effort against domestic violence inspired by the death of this young woman, Kiromy Fontanez.

In Connecticut we have already exceeded the number of domestic violence deaths that occurred in all of last year. Her death was the 10th in 2014 alone. Domestic violence takes a terrible, awful, unacceptable toll in lives and injuries, heartbreak and pain, and it is so avoidable and unnecessary.

We need to do more about domestic violence, but, as my colleague Senator MURPHY has commented so well, the chances of death as a result of domestic violence are increased by five times when there is a gun in the house. Guns and domestic violence are a dangerous toxic mix, and that is the reason for our legislation, the Lori Jackson Domestic Violence Survivor Protection Act. The legislation we have offered takes away guns, stops purchases and ownership of guns when there are restraining orders, when there is an objective reason to think there will be

this kind of threat of violence and rage and wrath.

The memory of these two people—who died just yesterday morning in the early hours of the Sunday following Independence Day—should focus our attention again on what is important, what should be our priority, what should be our first steps when it comes to guns. That is to make America safer.

Four months after the brutal murders in Sandy Hook, this body said no to the grieving Newtown families, to the people of Connecticut, and to the vast majority of American people who continue to support commonsense measures such as background checks. This body voted to prevent gun violence legislation from getting a final vote.

Today we will vote on cloture on the motion to proceed to the sportsmen's bill. The fact that we are now considering this legislation to expand recreational shooting on Federal lands without addressing the scourge of gun violence is a stark reminder of the Congress's misplaced priorities and unfulfilled obligations.

I sympathize with what my great colleague Senator HAGAN is trying to do. If the legislation we are considering were part of a broader national discussion and conversation about who should possess guns and how we should keep them out of the hands of dangerous people—criminals and mentally troubled people who are dangerous to themselves or others—it would be a different debate on the floor and the considerations for me would be different on this vote.

I spent last week going from town to town in Connecticut listening to constituents who asked me, What are you doing in Washington? What I heard a lot was, What are you doing in Washington to stop gun violence? When will you bring back the measures to stop gun violence that are the legacy and the lesson of Sandy Hook—a tragedy that still causes so much pain to so many people, thinking of those families, the 20 beautiful children and brave educators whose lives were lost that day. I cannot go back to Connecticut and tell those people who asked me about what we are doing about guns in America that what we have done is made it easier for Americans to shoot at targets, made it easier for big game trophy hunters to bring their polar bear rugs back from Canadian hunting grounds, and reduced regulations that govern shell cases. That is not my idea of where our priorities should be.

First things first. Let's stop gun violence. Let's at least take steps to reduce its horrific toll of death and injury, its cost in dollars. Let's try to find that bipartisan ground on reducing domestic violence or reaching out to people who need mental health treatment, and let's find common ground on making America safer. That common ground serves our best instincts—what makes our Nation the greatest Nation

in the history of the world, a nation whose independence we celebrated this weekend, with pride and joy, even as the terrible toll of gun violence continued in yesterday's early morning, over the weekend throughout America, where tens of thousands of deaths have followed the tragic, horrific, unspeakable tragedy of Sandy Hook.

I will vote against this legislation, against invoking cloture, with sadness and regret that that obligation and promise is as yet unfulfilled.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

BIPARTISAN SPORTSMEN'S ACT

Mrs. HAGAN. Madam President, in a few minutes the Senate will vote on whether to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act of 2014, a bill I introduced earlier this year with my friend and colleague from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI.

I am proud that by working alongside our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we have crafted a package of 12 provisions that have broad bipartisan support. I will be back on the floor at a later time to give a much more thorough, open, and in-depth presentation on our bill, but I wish to take a couple of minutes to highlight a couple of the key provisions.

One is to ensure that future generations do have an opportunity to enjoy our great outdoors as we do today. The Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act reauthorizes several landmark conservation programs, including the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act, and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

Our bill also includes regulatory reforms and enhancements that will benefit sportsmen and women across our country. For example, States will be able to allocate a greater portion of the Federal Pittman-Robertson funding to create and maintain shooting ranges on public land. This is important because we are currently facing a shortage of public shooting ranges across the country.

We will also enable hunters to purchase an electronic duck stamp. I can personally vouch for the benefits of this provision. Our son-in-law came to visit one year. My husband planned to take him duck hunting toward the end of the season. Unfortunately, three different places had sold out of duck stamps. When my husband buys his duck stamp for the season, he actually purchases extra ones, just in case family or friends come to visit during duck season. Senator WICKER's electronic duck stamp provision will allow my husband and other hunters to purchase duck stamps online—this is 2014—instead of traveling from post office to post office in search of a duck stamp.

The Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act will also help improve access for hunting and fishing on public lands and will require 1.5 percent, or \$10 million, of an-

nual Land and Water Conservation Fund money to be used to improve the access on our public lands.

It is important to note that we accomplish all of this without adding anything to the deficit. In fact, this act actually reduces the deficit by \$5 million over the next 10 years.

I believe we have assembled a strong bill that is going to benefit the anglers, the outdoor recreation enthusiasts, and the hunters in North Carolina and nationwide. I am proud to say this bipartisan act has 45 cosponsors—18 Democrats, 26 Republicans, and one Independent. We have cosponsors of all ideological backgrounds from every region of the country.

The list of organizations supporting our bill is also long and diverse. Over 40 organizations have endorsed the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act, ranging from the National Shooting Sports Foundation to the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, to Ducks Unlimited.

Outdoor recreation activities are part of the fabric of so many States, including North Carolina. From the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in the west to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore in the east, North Carolinians are passionate about the outdoors. Hunting, fishing, and hiking are a way of life, and many of these traditions have been handed down through my own family.

I am glad the Senate will debate the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act. In putting our bill together, Senator MURKOWSKI and I tried to pull the best ideas from Members of both of our parties. However, I do recognize that Members on both sides of the aisle have ideas for how to strengthen this bill. It is my hope we can take up, debate, and vote on sportsmen's-related amendments this week. I encourage my colleagues who have amendments to file them and come to the floor to discuss them.

In closing, this Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act of 2014 is a balanced bipartisan plan that is endorsed by 40 stakeholders, and it is fiscally responsible. I urge my colleagues to vote to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the bill so we can start debating steps we can take to benefit the more than 90 million sportsmen and women across the country.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

REFORMING FOSTER CARE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, for many years I have been an advocate for reforming the foster care system and making sure the government is doing the best it can to protect and care for those who are abused, neglected, and particularly when they are removed from their families. That is why Senator LANDRIEU of Louisiana and I started the Senate Caucus on Foster Youth. We wanted a forum to discuss policies and practices and to learn more about the challenges foster young people face. We want to make a

difference in the lives of vulnerable young people who don't have a permanent place to call home.

The caucus cannot function without the input and the insight from foster young people. These young people are the experts on the foster care system. They have been through it. They know the challenges. They tell us in this caucus what works and what needs to change. They share the experiences and provide us with real-world stories about how our policies truly affect them.

I wish to highlight the story of one particular person whom I have had the privilege of getting to know. Amnoni Myers is an intern in my office this summer. She is participating in the Congressional Coalition on Adoption Institute's Foster Youth Internship Program. I wish to tell her story because it is important not to forget there are young people in this country such as Amnoni who don't have a permanent family or a place to call home. Despite her circumstances, Amnoni has risen up and made a better life for herself. So allow me to share her story.

Amnoni Myers, a native of Boston, became a ward of the State on the day she was born. She was abandoned at birth. When she was 6 months old, Amnoni's great aunt learned of Amnoni and her two other siblings and decided to take care of them by taking them into her home. She lived in her great aunt's care for 10 years. Even though she had a better family environment, life still presented her with many challenges. Amnoni struggled with rejection and trauma at a very young age, resulting from different types of abuse.

At the age of 10, Amnoni was reunited with her biological mother because the State granted her temporary custody. Amnoni thought her life was finally secure. Wouldn't we think so, being at home with our birth mother? Her mother promised to care for her and never give her up again. Unfortunately, after 2 short years, Amnoni's mother voluntarily returned her and her siblings back to the State.

So at the age of 12, Amnoni was separated from her siblings and placed with foster families until the age of 18. Although Amnoni and her brother were placed together for a short period of time, they were later separated as Amnoni moved around in the system. During her time in foster care, she was moved several times, never experiencing permanency or stability. That is one of the things I learned through the work of this caucus; that when we talk to people who are in foster care, what do they want? They want permanency. They want a real mom and dad, and they would like to have a place to call home.

To Amnoni, foster parents seemed more interested in cash benefits for parenting rather than human investment. She experienced emotional and verbal abuse in places she stayed. She didn't know unconditional love. Her

foster families didn't take the time to manage her trauma but instead added to it.

One of the most difficult experiences Amnoni faced was aging out of the foster care system, and aging out issues with these young people is exactly why Senator LANDRIEU and I established the caucus I have already spoken about.

During the summer, while still in care, Amnoni entered an intense college preparation program that would determine if she was adequately prepared to enroll in a postsecondary institution. Already anxious about the future of her success and if she would be able to handle the workload of the program, she received a phone call from her social worker that afternoon. The bad news came that she was aging out. She was told that her foster mother was no longer being paid for Amnoni's bed. Because the money was running out for her foster parents, Amnoni was forced to leave the home immediately.

The shock and devastation of those words crushed Amnoni. She lived in that home with that family for 3 years. She considered it a long-term living situation. Amnoni returned to find her belongings packed in garbage bags waiting for her at the door. That is a story our caucus often hears.

Amnoni aged out of the system in a way no person should have to experience. She left a place she considered home, not knowing what her future would hold. She was on her own, shoved into independence with no family, support or a place to call home.

Amnoni's aging-out experience left her feeling shattered and confused. She felt betrayed by both her foster mother, who claimed to love her, and the child welfare system—in other words, the State she lived in—that claimed to protect her. While this experience quickly taught Amnoni the value of independence, she would have preferred to have a smoother transition into that independence.

When Amnoni left her so-called home at age 18, she was taken in by a former mentor and her family. She resided there for 5 years. Living there was a reminder that love, family, and support do exist.

In 2008 Amnoni learned she had post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, and anxiety. These diagnoses led her to take a break from school to gain control over these disruptions. Amnoni entered into a Christian residential program, Mercy Ministries, where she was able to gain a better understanding of herself. This experience motivated her to attend Gordon College, a Christian institution outside of Boston.

Today she is working in my office, sitting in this Chamber with me, learning how government works. She is becoming an advocate for foster youth who face the same experiences she faced.

Despite the challenges, Amnoni feels very fortunate. She has been able to attend college, graduate this year, and

hopes to pursue a meaningful career. Knowing that many children and youth do not have adequate support systems in their life to help them along their life journey, Amnoni pursued an education in social work and sociology.

Many people who have gone through similar experiences resort to other paths because of the lack of support and services. Many foster children age out of the system without supportive services in place to ensure healthier lives. Thankfully, Amnoni has had a network of support to guide and direct her through difficult times.

Amnoni's experience has fueled her passion to advocate for those who do not have a voice to fight for themselves. As Amnoni looks back on her life, she realizes her past does not have to determine her future. She is on her way to becoming a monumental figure for those who have suffered, giving youth across the country a voice and making a difference in this world.

I appreciate her willingness to let me share her story. It is so typical of so much that we hear in the caucus that Senator LANDRIEU and I formed. This young girl is a very brave woman. She knows we can learn from her. We will learn from her. We must do right by her and others in the foster care system.

I hope my colleagues have a chance to say hello to Amnoni while she is here in Washington, DC, and take a minute to commend her for being an advocate for other youth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I ask to speak on the nomination that is pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

KRAUSE NOMINATION

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise this afternoon to speak just for a couple moments—because we are limited in time to speak—about Cheryl Ann Krause who is the nominee for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

I want to review her credentials, some of which the Members of the Senate are familiar with in preparing for the vote.

Cheryl Ann Krause is a graduate of the Stanford Law School. She got her juris doctorate degree with distinction in 1993. She graduated from the University of Pennsylvania *summa cum laude*. Of course, I am especially proud of that as a Pennsylvanian.

She has an extensive career both as a member of law firms in the private sector as well as a prosecutor. Before I get to that, I want to mention her clerkships.

She clerked in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit for Judge Alex Kozinski. That was followed by a clerkship in the Supreme Court of the United States for Justice Anthony M. Kennedy.