With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from Texas.

BOSTON MARATHON BOMBINGS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, yesterday afternoon we were reminded that America faces determined enemies willing to engage in barbaric acts against innocent civilians—men, women, and children. On Patriots' Day—a day that has always been a celebration of American heritage and American freedom—terrorist bombings took the lives of at least three people standing near the finish line of the Boston Marathon, including an 8-year-old boy. His name was Martin Richard. He was watching runners complete the race alongside his family. His mother and his sister also sustained injuries, along with more than 150 other people.

We still don't know who is responsible for this terrible atrocity, but we do know the people of Boston responded to this attack with courage and compassion. As the smoke rose, the American people saw their fellow citizens running toward—not away but toward—the scene of the blast. From the police officers and the first responders who secured the bomb site and loaded the injured into ambulances to the marathon participants who literally ran to hospitals to donate blood, to the doctors and other medical professionals who performed emergency lifesaving treatments on the victims, to the Boston area residents who opened their homes to those who had been left stranded, this attack brought out the very best in our country.

In fact, in the immediate aftermath of the bombing, so many people rushed to donate blood, the Red Cross literally had to turn them away. Dr. Richard Wolfe, the head of the emergency medicine department at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, called it ''the smoothest sort of handling of mass casualty I've ever seen in my career''—something I hope none of us have to see again.

This Chamber has spent the last 4 months, and even years before that, debating issues such as taxes, spending, and health care. But the No. 1 responsibility of the Federal Government is to keep the American people safe and secure. Our response to this attack must be firm and unequivocal. We must send a clear message that we will never compromise our values or our freedom in the face of terrorist violence. We must stay on the offensive against the enemies of civilization and remain vigilant in our day-to-day lives. The victims of Boston deserve nothing less.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The Senator from Iowa.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, morning business is closed.

SAFE COMMUNITIES, SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 2013

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 649, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 649) to ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the national instant criminal background check system and require a background check for every firearm sale, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Manchin amendment No. 715, to protect Second Amendment rights, ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and provide a responsible and consistent background check process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be for debate only.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am glad we are proceeding on this very important legislation. The American people might be wondering why the Senate has not been voting on any amendments to the pending gun legislation.

The Senate voted on Thursday to proceed to the bill. This followed calls that the Senate should debate the bill, and that is why I said I am glad we are getting to it. There has been very little debate. The President has said various proposals deserve a vote. We, on this side of the aisle, don't intend to stand in the way of proceeding on those votes, particularly on the amendments. So I hope we are able to vote very soon.

Last week Senator MANCHIN and Senator TOOMEY unveiled an amendment on background checks. The media hailed the agreement as a way to pass gun control. The majority announced that the Manchin-Toomey amendment would be the first one we vote on. Since we are just starting the debate now, obviously we have not voted on the amendment.

We have not voted because despite claims from the other side, background checks are not and never have been the sweet spot of the gun control debate. We have not voted on it because supporters don't have the votes to pass it—at least at this point that is the way it appears to me—and I think they know it.

They don't have the votes even though published reports indicate that Vice President BIDEN, the President of the Senate, has been calling Senators and asking them to support the Manchin-Toomey bill. They must not be telling him what he wants to hear. They don't have the votes for background checks even though the Vice President has reportedly stated that the opposition to the proposal comes only from the ''black helicopter'' crowd.

Well, it doesn't come from that point.

The Manchin-Toomey amendment would impose new obligations on law-abiding gun owners. It would do so even though expanding gun background checks would have done nothing to stop Newtown or other mass killings. It would do so even though expanding background checks would do nothing to prevent these killings in the future.

I often quote the Deputy Director of the National Institute of Justice, who recently wrote that background checks could work only if they were universal and were accompanied by gun registration. Of course, most Members of the Senate oppose gun registration. They know what has happened historically with gun registration. In other countries it has led to gun confiscation, and Members of the Senate—but more importantly, lots of people appearing at our town meetings—fear that could happen and don't want to go down that road.

Supporters of the background check amendment claim that it strengthens the rights of gun owners; but, in fact, it does not. The fact is the opposite is true. Opposition to the amendment does not come from the fringe elements of society. In fact, one of the reasons the Senate has not voted on the amendment is the widespread opposition to the amendment from many quarters. If only fringe elements had problems with it, we would be voting on this amendment. So keep watching. If we do not vote on the Manchin-Toomey amendment, it means the proponents of that idea know they don't have the votes to pass it. If we turn to assault weapons or magazines, then it is clear to all that the majority knows it is far from the number of votes they need. I think people are going to be waiting while they try to pick up the votes that will probably never be there.

Meanwhile, on this side of the aisle, our caucus hopes to have their amendments considered soon and to vote on those amendments. Our amendments, unlike the Manchin-Toomey amendment, will actually strengthen the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding gun owners and help thwart gun violence by criminals. In fact, there are reports that the other side of the aisle wants to block one of our amendments which would do exactly that.

So that is the situation. Maybe there are leaders around here who would dispute me, but that is the way I see it. The majority doesn't have the votes to pass their amendment, so we are not voting. The majority wants to block Republican amendments that they fear would pass, so we are not voting on the Republican amendments either.

The Senate voted to proceed to the bill. The Senate voted to have a debate. The Senate was promised an open amendment process which would mean we would conduct votes on the various amendments that will be offered, but so far that has not happened. I hope it will happen soon, so I ask that the audience stay tuned.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we are debating one of the most important bills we have had before the Senate in a long time. The reason we are debating this subject is because of what happened in Newtown, CT, on December 14, and the gun violence that takes its toll every day in cities all across America, including in my home State of Illinois. We know because we read and hear about it in the news and from the victims.

At this moment our Nation is saddened by what happened yesterday in Boston. We still don't know what the cause of that was or who was responsible for it. I just have to say we are stunned by it.

Members of the Senate and I—who have worked on the immigration bill—had planned to announce that bill today in a press conference. We have postponed that announcement out of respect to the people who have fallen, those who were injured, and their families. It is a moment of grave concern across America which was expressed well by the President last night.

We are waiting for the information and details to build a case on those who are responsible. I, for one—and I am sure my colleagues feel the same way—don't want to rush to judgment until we have the facts as to the parties responsible. The sadness we feel for the victims and the sadness we feel for America—an open and free America where people stand on the sidelines cheering marathon runners—is one that is profound in the Senate today.

The issue before us now is gun safety. It comes before us because 20 beautiful little first graders were massacred at their grade school—at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, CT. Six of their teachers and administrators literally gave their lives in defense of those children. There is not a parent or grandparent alive who doesn't identify with that horrible loss.

Last week I met with a group of parents, still grieving, from Sandy Hook Elementary School who came to Congress to beg us to do something to spare future families and future children from this type of massacre. I met with them in the morning. As you can imagine, there was not a dry eye in the room as they showed me the photographs of their beautiful children who are now gone. I commend them for their courage and stepping forward.

Now the question is whether the Senate has the courage to step forward. This is not an easy vote politically. I think we know what is at stake. I come from a pretty diverse State. I come from downstate Illinois, which is more rural. They have small towns and more gun owners than the great city of Chicago.

For 14 years, as a Congressman in downstate Illinois, I ran in an area where gun issues were very volatile and very important to many people. I took some positions which the gun lobby did not care for, and several times they decided they would wage a campaign against me when I ran for reelection. I survived their attacks and eventually was elected to the Senate.

This is the first meaningful gun safety legislation we have taken up since I was elected to this body over 16 years ago. We are here because of what happened in Newtown, CT. There is no question about it.

I often remind people that it was a little over 2 years ago that one of our own, Gabrielle Giffords, a Congresswoman from Arizona, was at a town meeting when she was gunned down and shot pointblank in the face. We did nothing about it. There were no hearings or changes in the law. It was just another gun statistic to many people.

But Newtown touched our hearts: to think that those beautiful little children could be massacred in their grade school classroom. One child was shot 11 times with a semiautomatic weapon that was firing off rounds as fast as this deranged individual could load it.

We are here today in the beginning of a debate on this important legislation. What is at stake? Well, this is about background checks. Here are the basic questions we need to ask: Do we believe the current Federal law, which prohibits a convicted felon, a person who is under an order from the court to avoid domestic abuse, a person who has been judged mentally incompetent—should they be able to buy a gun in America?

Now, 90 percent of Americans say that is an easy question, and the answer is, no; they should not be able to buy a gun. In fact, 75 percent of gun owners say that.

I come from a family of gun owners. They are responsible, law-abiding citizens who would never dream of looking the other way if a convicted felon or mentally deranged person wanted to buy a gun. They store their guns safely. They use them in a safe manner, and they represent the majority of gun owners across America.

So if this is such an obvious question where 90 percent of Americans agree we should not sell guns to those who have been convicted of a felony, for example, why is this being debated? What is the big deal? It comes down to the second part of the question: What would you think—and this Capitol is filled with tourists, many of whom flew on airplanes to get here today—if before the plane took off, the flight attendant said: Welcome aboard; fasten your seatbelts. We hope everyone has a safe flight. Incidentally, the TSA would like to inform everyone that they have closely checked the passengers onboard the plane to see if they are carrying guns or bombs. We are happy to report we have checked 60 percent of them, and they are not carrying guns or bombs. Have a nice flight.

Sixty percent—does that give anybody refuge, consolation, or peace of mind? That is what is going on today with the sale of guns. Up to forty percent of firearms sold in America today are not subject to background checks.

What difference does that make? I want to tell the story which goes back to a moment in history in my State of Illinois which illustrates why this is so important. Ricky Byrdsong was the head coach of the Northwestern University men's basketball team back in the 1990s. He was a great fellow. He was a loving father of three children and a man of deep Christian faith.

On July 2, 1999, Coach Byrdsong was walking with two of his children through his neighborhood in Skokie, IL, a great town. A White supremacist drove up and shot Ricky Byrdsong to death in front of his kids. He was 43 years old.

This gunman ended up going on a shooting spree for days across Illinois and Indiana, randomly targeting African Americans, Jews, and Asian Americans. In the end, he killed two and wounded nine.

Here is the reality. The man who did the shooting never, ever should have owned a gun. He was prohibited by law from buying guns because of a domestic violence restraining order against him. Before his murderous rampage, he tried to buy a gun from a federally licensed dealer in Peoria Heights, IL. He was rejected when it was revealed he was prohibited from purchasing a gun. But this white supremacist took advantage of a gap in our background check laws that still exists today. He found an advertisement for guns in the classified ad section of a newspaper.

A gun trafficker named Donald Fiessinger had been buying guns from a dealer—over 72 guns in a 2-year period—then turning around and reselling them through classified ads to buyers who wouldn't have to go through a background check. Ricky Byrdsong's killer bought two handguns from Fiessinger without a background check. He then used those guns on a shooting spree and killed Ricky Byrdsong on the streets of Skokie in front of his children.

The amendment before us today would make that more difficult, if not impossible. Under the Manchin-Toomey amendment, a background check would be required to sell guns advertised in a newspaper. This would have shut down the opportunity for Ricky Byrdsong's killer to get this murderous weapon. That is one of the issues before us, and it is critically important.

JOE MANCHIN is from West Virginia. JOE MANCHIN is a conservative Democrat, no question about it; no debate on that issue. PAT TOOMEY is one of the

most conservative Republicans from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The two of them came together and said, Let's write something that is respectful of the Second Amendment, respectful of the rights of gun owners, but closes the gaps in the law when it comes to background checks. I think they have done a good job. But let me add quickly they put some things in this amendment I don't like at all. Let me be specific.

The amendment repeals the law that prevents gun dealers from selling handguns to out-of-State buyers, and it expands civil immunity to unlicensed gun dealers. I don't want to vote for those two things, but this is the nature of a compromise and this is the nature of the Senate. If we are going to pass this, I have to be prepared to take on and accept some issues I personally don't agree with because of the larger good. To me, the notion of plugging this 40-percent gap in the sale of firearms is so compelling I am prepared to accept parts of this amendment I don't like. I am never going to get exactly what I want on the floor of the Senate, nor will any Senator, nor should they expect to. We have differences of opinion, differences of party, differences of philosophy.

I commend Senators MANCHIN and TOOMEY for stepping up. This wasn't easy. They could have stepped back and said, Let somebody else do this. They haven't. I know they have taken some grief over it. The major gun lobby organizations oppose this Manchin-Toomey amendment, but we need to do this. Would it have saved the lives of those children at Newtown, CT? No. This measure would not have, because the guns he used were purchased by his mother who could legally purchase the guns. But it could have saved the life of Ricky Byrdsong and it could also save the lives of so many others who are being gunned down on the streets because people are owning and using guns who have no legal right to them. The Manchin-Toomey amendment moves us in the direction of closing that gap in the law.

I know the gun lobby opposes this amendment. I don't know what their position is on the underlying bill, but I know that Americans and gun owners overwhelmingly support it. So here is the question: Can the Senate rise above the political pressure and vote for this measure? We need 60 votes, and it means it has to be bipartisan, not just the majority on this side of the aisle, but a good number on the other side.

I am encouraged by last week's vote because last week we had a preliminary vote, a procedural vote, about whether we were even going to debate this issue, and there was a question about it. Before the vote came up, 13 Republican Senators, supported by the Republican minority leader, sent a public letter saying they were going to oppose any effort to even debate the gun issue on the floor of the Senate. It looked pretty bad when the Republican leader took that position. But 16 Republican Senators stepped up and showed, I thought, courage and a commitment to this institution by voting with us to move forward on this debate. I am not assuming their votes on any issues, but I want to commend them in the spirit of this institution which has failed in recent years to accept its mandate and deliberate and vote on the most important issues of our time. I commend them for remembering that and for committing themselves to at least engaging in this debate on the floor of the Senate.

What about background checks and the Second Amendment? Well, the gun lobby argues that background checks are unconstitutional, even though Justice Scalia made it clear in the Heller decision, which was the decision on the Second Amendment that said, basically, the Second Amendment is a personal right to bear arms, not the right of a militia, which had been argued for years. Scalia said in that decision: ''laws imposing conditions and qualifications on the commercial sale of arms'' are ''presumptively lawful.'' So there is no doubt, at least in Justice Scalia's mind or mine, that a background check is consistent with the Second Amendment.

The gun lobby also argues that background checks are ineffective. We have heard this argument: Well, go ahead and pass all the laws you want and all the law-abiding citizens will live by them but the criminals won't. Here is what they failed to note. Nearly 2 million prohibited purchasers have been blocked from buying a gun since background checks went into effect. They were so stupid, so careless, they tried to buy a gun anyway. They were stopped. The argument, of course, then goes: Well, why are there so many gun crimes committed? Well, because they get guns through other means which are also addressed by the bill. Straw purchases, for example; or through the ads in the newspaper I mentioned earlier. And the argument that unless a law is air tight and will stop all gun violence we shouldn't pass it—are we going to use that standard for speeding on highways or for texting on highways? I don't think so. We do our best to set a reasonable standard for the good of this society, understanding there will be those who violate the law. The same thing holds true for this argument.

The gun lobby argues we should not improve background checks until we prosecute more cases where buyers fail their background checks. Well, what of the agency that gathers information for that prosecution—ATF the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives? If we look to that agency, we will note that for years now the gun lobby and the NRA have worked to keep this as a leaderless agency and to make sure it didn't have the power to enforce the laws on the books. They can't have it both ways. They can't stop the ATF from its job and then argue they don't prosecute these gun violations seriously.

Here is the bottom line: We are going to have votes soon to see where Members of the Senate stand. Are they going to stand with our police officers, religious leaders, teachers, prosecutors, doctors, mayors, and the victims of gun violence and their families? Are they going to stand with the strong majority of 90 percent of Americans who support these reform proposals to save lives in this country? Or, will they stand with the gun lobby that refuses to compromise even when lives could be saved?

I know where I am going to stand. I am going to stand with Ricky Byrdsong's family and his widow Sherialyn. She wrote me earlier this year when I held a hearing on gun violence and this is what she said:

> How a criminal is able to buy a gun with no questions asked is absurd. Something must be done about this.

An important question from an important person whose life was changed forever because we do not have a strong law. I stand with so many other families who have suffered tragedy, including those families from Newtown who were here last week, as well as the families and the victims in my hometown of East St. Louis, IL, and the city of Chicago I am honored to represent. They are sick and tired of the gun lobby that puts industry profits before common sense and they are tired of the gun lobby having its way in Congress year after deadly year.

I urge my colleagues to join with the majority of Americans who support commonsense reforms for gun safety. I urge my colleagues to support the compromise Manchin-Toomey amendment and the bipartisan legislation on the Senate floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the period for debate only on the firearms bill, S. 649, be extended until 3:30 p.m. and that I be recognized at that time.

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

Mr. REID. We will continue to work on getting an agreement setting forth some initial amendments and votes in relation to the gun safety legislation. The Republican leaders said they needed to have their caucus first. We are hopeful that we will receive a positive response to our efforts soon after the two caucus lunches and begin moving forward on some initial amendments and votes in relation to gun safety legislation.

RECESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we recess until 2:15 p.m. for our caucuses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:20 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

SAFE COMMUNITIES, SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 2013—Continued

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

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.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, my colleagues, the week is finally here when we come to the floor to have votes on a piece of legislation we have been waiting on for decades. This Chamber is finally talking about what we can do to stop the plague of gun violence which has rippled through every single corner of this country.

As I watched these mass shootings play out over the course of the last 10 years—whether it be in Colorado or Arizona or Virginia—we think to ourselves that this is just something we are watching. This is just something that has happened somewhere else to someone else. We never think it could happen to us.

I will never forget that day I was in Bridgeport, CT, and it was right before Christmas. We were getting ready to take a train so I could bring my two little boys, along with my wife, to look at the pageantry of New York City. That was the day I got the call that there had been a shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School.

I thought it must have been a mistake. I thought, well, to the extent there is something going on at Sandy Hook Elementary School—this quiet hamlet in western Connecticut—it must be some disgruntled employee who walked in and had a grudge.

What I learned over the next few minutes during the half-hour drive to Newtown made my blood freeze. I learned this was a mass shooting involving dozens of adults and kids. I realized it was now happening in my neighborhood, in my State, in my town.

Unfortunately—as I stood at the firehouse where the community gathered that day and all the parents stood waiting for their children to come back or not come back from that school—I realized I had way too many colleagues I could call upon for advice on how, as an elected official, to deal with a tragedy of this magnitude. I could call my friends in Arizona, I could call my friends in Colorado, or I could call my new colleague, Governor KAINE, from Virginia. There were too many places to turn, and it happened to us in Connecticut in a place we never, ever thought would be subjected to gun violence. We are finally at the tipping point on a debate of what we can do. Through all of the back and forth this week and last week about whether we would have a vote on this floor or would we have to overcome a filibuster, could we come to a compromise on background checks, would we add provisions to ban high-capacity magazines, underneath it all are these victims. There have been thousands of victims. There were the little girls and boys in Newtown, but also 16-, 17-, 31-, and 68-year-olds from across the country who have been gunned down over the course of the last several decades without this body raising a finger to try to make things different. Well, it is time for those victims' stories to be told.

As I did last week, I will be on the floor this week so I can share the stories of victims of gun violence. I will tell stories of lives which were cut way too short because of guns, and, in part, because this body has not been serious enough to stand up and do something about it.

I want to start this afternoon's remarks by returning to the place where it all started for me, and that is Sandy Hook Elementary School. There are 26 stories to tell of the people who lost their lives at that school that day, and I think I have gotten to about 20 or 21 of them. I will talk about the last few stories. It is unbelievable.

I have not had a chance to tell the story of Anne Marie Murphy, even though I told the story of what she did that day on the floor at least once. I just shared her story with my Democratic colleagues.

Before that fatal day, Anne Marie Murphy was an amazing person. Anne Marie was a special education teacher, and she loved her work. She sought out working in the area of special education because she knew she had a talent, as so many of her students and the parents who worked with her found out. They knew she had a talent for reaching out and touching little boys' and little girls' lives.

In fact, it is not a coincidence that a number of the kids who were killed in Sandy Hook Elementary School that day were kids with autism because Sandy Hook was known as a school that had a talent for reaching out to kids on the autistic spectrum. And Anne Marie was part of that story. She was a special education teacher. She was a mother of four wonderful children: Kelly, Colleen, Paige, and Thomas. She grew up in Katonah, NY. She graduated from St. Mary's School there before attending JFK High School in Somers, NY. Then she got her degree in Connecticut at a school that actually was in the process of educating one of the other teachers who was killed that day, Victoria Soto. Southern Connecticut State University is where she got her degree.

She was remembered by her friends and family as sweet, happy, outgoing, and caring, and all of those characteristics came into play that day. I shared this story with my colleagues last week and then behind closed doors today, but I will share it quickly again.

That day, Anne Marie Murphy had in her charge a little boy named Dylan Hockley. When the bullets started flying, Anne Marie took Dylan into her arms and did her best to comfort him and perhaps shield him. When the police came into that classroom, that is how they found Dylan and Anne Marie—in each other's arms. To the Hockleys, the fact that there was some small measure of love being expressed to Dylan in the last horrible moments gives them some small measure of peace. She died a hero doing what she did best.

Anne Marie had been doing this for awhile, but she had a lot of years to give. She was only 52 years old. She could have continued to change the lives of children in need, children with autism, for another 10-plus years. Just think of all the lives she could have affected. How many more Dylan Hockleys could she have found and nurtured and helped work through their autism? We will never get to know. She was killed that day.

Grace McDonnell's parents are amazing. They have been down here to Washington a number of times already. They have led a lot of the debate in our communities in Connecticut about what we do to change the issue of guns and gun violence. They do so because they lost their daughter Grace McDonnell that day.

Grace was 7 years old when she died. Grace had asked for a purple cake with a turquoise peace sign and polka dots when she turned 7. That is what she wanted, I guess, for her birthday, was that purple cake. She loved the color purple and she loved the color pink, as so many of these girls did, and her funeral, which I had the honor of attending, was just buried in pink.

Grace loved the beach. One could always find Grace McDonnell on the beach. She loved country music. Taylor Swift and Kenny Chesney were amongst her favorites. She played soccer. She participated in gymnastics. She had a dog, Puddin', that she absolutely adored.

She was a very kind, wonderful little girl, so her parents have tried to think of the ways, big and small, in which they can try to pass along the kindness their 7-year-old little girl Grace showed for the world. They have done that by trying to explain to this country who she is. They have done that by taking all the art she produced—Grace was a fantastic artist, and many of us