

on the same side on the symbolism of this, but we can't pass laws that do exactly what all of us have said is wrong with our penal system, all of the unintended consequences. There is one here, and I ask, in a very polite way—I have been asking for 3 months—for one small change, and I will let the bill go today, on this day, if we can have it.

The changes have been out there. They are not brand-new. They have been in Senator BOOKER's office for 3 months. We have tried to, as he has had objections, work with him on his objections.

So I would ask unanimous consent, once again, to pass the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BOOKER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, this is a bill that has already passed this body. Same bill, same language. There was no objection. Only four Members of the House of Representatives objected. Same bill, same language.

I have heard this objection. We disagree with this. The truth is, what is being proposed is not just opposed by me, but our Republican colleagues who are sponsoring this bill, in this body, oppose these corrections as well.

In addition to that, changes to this bill now would send it back to the House of Representatives. This is a tactic that will send this bill back over to the House, where again it would have to be voted on.

This idea that somehow someone would be brought up on lynching charges for a slapping is absurd, especially as you see, with hate crime legislation, how difficult that is even to prove.

So I am deeply disappointed by the objections we have heard that were not made manifest last year, in 2019, but somehow seem to be stopping it in 2020. So I object, with this prediction: We, as a body, will correct historic ills and pass lynching legislation through this body, through the House of Representatives. One day in this Nation, this legislation will pass.

Perhaps it will have to wait until I am not here, until Senator PAUL is not here, unless he decides to go back to the 2019 Senator PAUL.

The question is, What side of history will we ultimately be on? I pray that it happens in this Congress. I pray that the President signs legislation against lynching. How historic that would be. But today it is not going to happen, obviously.

I am telling you right now, this celebration will come. This moment in American history will come. The frustrating thing for me is, at a time when this country hungers for common sense, racial reconciliation, an acknowledgement of our past and a looking forward to the better future, this will be one of the sad days where that possibility was halted.

As we all know, one of the great leaders that Republicans and Democrats all hail asked that question—How long will it take?—and the simple answer is not long because the truth crushed to earth will rise again; not long because you reap what you sow; not long because the arc of the moral universe is long but it bends toward justice.

We will pass this legislation. I pray that the Members of this body, as we are right now, are the ones to do it.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, before my colleagues exit the Chamber, I want to acknowledge their words. I want to say thank you. The passion, the emotion, the true rawness in your words are words that I think all of us, as Members of the Senate, should hear, reflect, and respect. I just want you to know I am thankful I was on the floor to personally hear. Because we can read words, but it is when we have the ability to hear and to feel those words that their true meaning comes out, so I appreciate and I thank you for that.

PROTESTS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I had asked to come and speak on the floor of the Senate on this day, June 4. I have been actually looking forward to it and planning speaking time for months now.

June 4 is a significant day in the fight for women's suffrage. It was on June 4 of 1919 that Congress approved the amendment and sent it to the States for ratification, and then it was in 1920 that the 19th Amendment was ratified by the States.

So this was to be a time of celebration, of recognition, of women's suffrage, this centennial event.

Since that time that I first looked to schedule this, my, how the world has changed. We have been in the midst of a pandemic—over 100,000 American lives lost to the COVID-19 virus. We are in the midst of an economic crisis the likes of which we haven't seen in decades and decades.

And, just a week ago now, we witnessed the killing of George Floyd on our streets, in broad daylight. And today, June 4, is not only a recognition of women's suffrage, but it is the funeral of George Floyd.

So before I speak to the matter I intended to speak on today, I want to just briefly comment on where I believe we are as a nation right now.

I was walking into work this morning, and in my neighbor's yard is a placard, a yard sign. It has been there for some years, actually, now. It is a partial quote of Martin Luther King that states: "We can't be silent about the things that matter."

You think about those things that matter: equality, justice, the fundamental truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by God with

certain rights. And when those rights are denied, when they are violated, it is our responsibility to address the injustice. It is not our responsibility as elected Members of the U.S. Senate; it is our responsibility as fellow humans, as Americans who believe in these principles of justice and equality.

President Bush had some words this week that I found very direct, very comforting at a difficult time when it is hard to be comforted, when our spirits are so dis comforted and agitated right now. But he reminded us that achieving justice for all is the duty of all. It is the duty of all.

And we are hurting now as a nation. We have wounds from racism that have never been allowed to heal—and those words were just shared here on this floor moments ago—wounds that have never been allowed to heal, wounds that are still so open and raw. And healing can't take place until the hurt and the anger and the anguish that so many in this country still feel, so many African Americans, so many—so many who feel that the system is meant for somebody but not them; that there is not equal justice under the law; that it must be the law for somebody else.

This has been hard—hard on all of us, as we have seen the protests, many of them peaceful. In my home State, Alaskans are coming together with a shared sense of duty and responsibility to speak up about things that matter and doing so in a way that brings us together rather than divides.

We must condemn the violence we see on the street with the looting, but stopping the looting is not going to close this wound. We heal when we acknowledge our weaknesses, when we acknowledge our failures, and when we vow to address the things that matter, like equality and justice.

What we say and how we say it truly matters. I have been challenged by some. I have been chastised by some very close friends who have said: You are silent, Lisa. Why are you silent? Why haven't you—you—fixed what we are seeing?

And I have struggled. I have struggled with the right words. As a White woman born and raised in Alaska with a family who was privileged, I can't feel that openness and rawness that I just heard expressed by my friends CORY and KAMALA. I haven't lived their life.

But I can listen, and I can educate myself. And I can try to be a healer at a time when we need to be healed. That is my commitment and my pledge going forward to those I serve in Alaska and to those I serve in this country.

This is challenging for us. We know this, but we are an extraordinary country. We are an extraordinary people with extraordinary resilience.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, let me turn to the fight—the century fight

for women's suffrage, the right to vote, the right to be treated equally, the right to be heard. It is a history that is long and interesting, sometimes very colorful.

I have had an opportunity these past couple of weeks to be reading a collection of stories about how women in the West worked to really be the vanguards, if you will, on the suffrage movement. You don't necessarily hear them spoken to with great frequency, but, in fairness, it is many of those Western States—it was Wyoming that was the first mover.

So reading some of their stories was a good reminder—a good reminder—of the role that many in Alaska have also played. We have been relatively progressive when it comes to women's rights—so progressive that many Alaskan women received equal voting rights with men in 1913. This was 7 years before the 19th Amendment was ratified. Alaska was still a territory and was still going to be a territory for a long time going forward.

The sorry and the sad part of that history, though, was that not all Alaskan women were given that right to vote. Alaskan Native women were excluded. They were excluded based on citizenship and civility assessment as well as literacy tests that prevented Alaska Natives—not just the women but some Native men—from voting for several more decades.

We recognize through a State day of observation and recognition the work of Elizabeth Peratrovich, an Alaska Native woman from Southeastern Alaska, who was the driving force behind our first antidiscrimination law. This was back in 1945, nearly 20 years before Congress passed the Civil Rights Act.

This year, on the 75th anniversary of the bill's passage, the U.S. Mint has actually created a gold coin in her honor. As you look at that coin and reflect on her role, on the significance of that proud, strong, fierce Native woman leader, you can't help but be proud of her.

The fight for women's suffrage was waged, as we know, for decades and decades. But again, the women in the West led the way.

As I was reading the recount of the Alaska suffrage initiative, it was reflected that the women in Alaska didn't really have to work that hard to get it; that it was just "provided" to them. I think there is more to that history than that, but a newspaper publication at the time, *The Daily Alaskan*, in 1904, argued that while women's suffrage might be disfavored as a general proposition, the merits were different in Alaska.

And he says the women there "are brave and noble helpers in the development of a frontier country" and "not the pampered dolls of society."

So today it still probably holds true that we have some pretty strong women in Alaska. We own and operate fishing vessels. We work as oil rig operators, diesel mechanics. We have some

extraordinary Alaskan women, industry leaders leading our Alaska Native corporations, leading our oil companies. We are leaders in education and advocates for children and seniors and victims of domestic violence. They truly have helped not only our State but our country.

The 100th Anniversary of Women's Suffrage is a reminder of the progress that we have made as a nation. But we know that we have more to do and that inequities remain whether in the workforce or pay equality. Continuing that work is a matter that we have not relaxed on. That work includes getting the Equal Rights Amendment signed into law.

The Equal Rights Amendment was first written and introduced by Alice Paul at a conference commemorating the 75th anniversary of the Seneca Falls Convention in 1923. But it wasn't until 1972 that the ERA passed through Congress and was sent to the States with a 7-year deadline for ratification that was eventually extended until 1982.

It is a pretty simple amendment. It is pretty short. "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex." That is the Equal Rights Amendment, in addition to the implementing provisions following that. But that is the context.

In Alaska, I am proud to say that we were one of the early adopters, having ratified the Equal Rights Amendment on April 5, 1972. More recently, Virginia became the 38th State to have ratified the amendment, which brings us to the three-fourths threshold needed for ratification. Unfortunately, this milestone was reached after the deadline for ratification. It had already expired, so Senator CARDIN and I have introduced a resolution, S.J. Res. 6, which would remove the time limit from the joint resolution that passed the Congress in 1972.

I have asserted time and again—and Senator CARDIN, so many—we have said that you cannot put a time limit on women's equality. It has been 100 years since women were granted the equal right of voting. Women's equality is fundamental to the American way of life, and it is far past time to be expressly recognized in the Constitution.

I thank Senator CARDIN for his leadership in working on this resolution with me and all the Members of Congress who fought with us in support of the ERA. I thank the advocates who continue to call their Senators, call their Congressmen, who lift their voices to support this important cause. We have work to do. We will continue that work.

I want to note that my colleague Senator CARDIN was here on the floor, was planning to speak on this matter today, but our time schedules got compressed, so his statement has been included as part of the RECORD. I want to acknowledge the good work and the partnership that we have on this.

With this, I yield the floor.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, in this time of renewed interest for fairness and equality for all men and women and nationwide and worldwide protests, I urge my colleagues to think about what we can do to create a more just society. Indeed, one of the founding documents of our country, the Declaration of Independence, provides that "all men are created equal," in the famous words of Thomas Jefferson.

But let me remind my colleagues about our history here as the Continental Congress met to debate independence of the United States from Great Britain. In a letter dated March 31, 1776, Abigail Adams wrote to her husband, the future President John Adams, urging him and the other Members of the Continental Congress not to forget about the Nation's women when fighting for America's freedom.

The future First Lady wrote in part, "I long to hear that you have declared an independency. And, by the way, in the new code of laws which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make, I desire you would remember the ladies and be more generous and favorable to them than our ancestors. Do not put such unlimited power into the hands of the husbands. Remember, all men would be tyrants if they could. If particular care and attention is not paid to the ladies, we are determined to foment a rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any laws in which we have no voice or representation."

Well, women of the United States would indeed have to wait a long time just to get the right to vote in America. Indeed, even after the Civil War, which almost tore this country apart over slavery, the Fifteenth Amendment ratified by Congress and the States in 1870 provided that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Women had tried again to include the right to vote in the Constitution but were rebuffed.

But the women of this country did not give up. So they kept agitating and lobbying for the right to vote, and they were ultimately successful, when Congress and the States ratified the 19th Amendment in 1920, which states: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

However, while women in American gained the right to vote in 1920, we all know that women are still not treated equally under the law and that civil rights are the great unfinished business of America.

Our fight for the Equal Rights Amendment, ERA, officially began shortly after passage of the 19th Amendment, the culmination of the long-running women's suffrage movement that guaranteed women the right to vote.

Alice Paul, leader of the National Women's Party, recognized the need for further laws in order to provide full legal equality to women in all activities, not just voting. Her proposal for an amendment for equal treatment under the law regardless of sex marked the first iteration of the ERA. U.S. Senator Charles Curtis would introduce this proposal for the first time in October 1921. Over the years, both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party would include the ERA in their platforms. Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy both indicated their support for the ERA. Needless to say, the ERA has a long history, and throughout that time, it enjoyed the notable bipartisan support.

The ERA has been able to count on such support precisely because of the widespread need recognized by both sides of the aisle for equal treatment under the law. What is at stake here is simply the issue of putting women on an even playing field with men. This is not about empowering one demographic group over another, but ensuring that discrimination on the basis of sex is no longer an obstacle to prevent women from enjoying the same rights and protections that men enjoy.

As the late Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia articulated: "Certainly the Constitution does not require discrimination on the basis of sex. The only issue is whether it prohibits it. It doesn't." The fight for the ERA aims to fill this gap in the law.

When Congresswoman Martha Griffiths introduced her ERA in Congress in the 92nd Congress, the House of Representatives passed the measure by a vote of 354 yeas to 24 nays. Five months later, the Senate passed it by a vote of 84 yeas to 8 nays. It received an immediate endorsement from President Richard Nixon upon its passage. While the ERA would in time become ratified by most States, it fell just three short of the three-fourths requirement of 38 by the measure's deadline of March 22, 1979.

When Senator MURKOWSKI and I came together to introduce S.J. Res. 6 on January 26, 2019, we committed ourselves to advancing this nearly century-long fight for equality between men and women. Our measure would remove the deadline for ratification.

Remember that the Constitution contains no deadline for the ratification of constitutional amendments, and in 1992 Congress declared the 27th Amendment ratified after more than 200 years, which prohibits Congress from changing its own pay before an intervening election. And the States have recently woken up when it comes to the ERA, with Illinois, Nevada, and, most recently, Virginia ratifying the ERA, reaching the number of 38 State ratifications, or three-quarters of the States.

I would note that our companion House resolution introduced by Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER was passed by the House earlier this year, and so

this issue is awaiting final action in the Senate.

As Congress looks to what it can do to create a more just society, ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment, ERA, would finally give women the legal protection consistent with ideals of our Nation. I am therefore proud to have partnered with Republican Senator LISA MURKOWSKI of Alaska in introducing a joint resolution that would remove the deadline for ratification of this crucial amendment.

And we picked this historic day to discuss it, as the Senate approved the women's suffrage amendment—the 19th Amendment to our Constitution—on June 4, 1919.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a joint editorial that I wrote with my colleague and friend, Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska, talking about why it is time to finally ratify the ERA.

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

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 25, 2019]
IT'S TIME TO FINALLY PASS THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

(By Ben Cardin and Lisa Murkowski)

Men and women should be treated equally under the law. It seems pretty basic, right?

As we approach the 100th anniversary of women's suffrage, it comes as a shock to so many that the U.S. Constitution does not guarantee women the same rights and protections as men.

We come from different ends of the political spectrum, but we agree that this needs to change. Women compose a majority of the American population but continue to be underrepresented in government, elected office, the courts and business world. A level playing field should not be a euphemism but rather a reality for women (and men) from Anchorage to Annapolis and everywhere in between.

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

This is the full substance of the Equal Rights Amendment. It's a little less than a tweet, but it will make a positive difference in the lives of millions of women.

Why is this still necessary? During a 2011 interview, Justice Antonin Scalia summed up the need for an Equal Rights Amendment. He said: "Certainly the Constitution does not require discrimination on the basis of sex. The only issue is whether it prohibits it. It doesn't."

On the other side of the spectrum, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg laid out the rationale for the ERA in simple terms: "Every constitution written since the end of World War II includes a provision that men and women are citizens of equal stature. Ours does not."

Why has it taken this long? Per the Constitution, an amendment must be ratified by three-fourths of the states to be enacted. While most amendments are put forward without a time limit, this one came with a seven-year deadline. The original was extended to 10 years, but still, only 35 States had ratified the ERA by 1982.

While the clock stood frozen at the federal level, today, nearly half of the States—including Maryland and Alaska—have a version of the ERA written into their constitutions. Gender-based equality represents the present-day views of the vast majority of people across the United States, and is the

spirit that underpins our bipartisan legislation.

The deadline passed in 1982, so isn't this effort futile? Not at all.

Nationally, momentum began to shift about two years ago, as women across the country began to raise their voices again in calls for solidarity and equality. The ERA had never gone away, but the #Me Too movement gave it a jolt of energy and a new spotlight for inequalities in U.S. law.

In March 2017, 45 years to the day after Congress overwhelmingly approved the ERA, Nevada became the 36th state to ratify the amendment. And then, in May 2018, Illinois became the 37th.

What had for years been referred to as a three-state plan—working to have Congress remove the ratification deadline so that three more states could ratify the ERA, and it would become enshrined in our constitution—had suddenly become a one-state plan.

Earlier this month, Virginia started the ratification process in their state legislature. Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina and Utah could also become state No. 38. Congress can do its part by explicitly removing the deadline it once set.

Article V of the Constitution contains no time limits for ratification of amendments. The states finally ratified the 27th Amendment in 1992 regarding congressional pay raises more than 200 years after Congress proposed it in 1789 as part of the Bill of Rights.

The original deadline for ERA ratification was not in the amendment itself but only in the text of the joint resolution proposing the amendment. This is to say the amendment itself has no arbitrary deadline attached.

Whether on purpose or not, Congress handcuffed itself at the time it passed the ERA. But this Congress can and should easily amend that language to remove the deadline for ratification.

We are proud to work together on a bipartisan basis to move this essential legislation over the finish line and finally make the ERA part of the Constitution—guaranteeing equality under the law for women.

Women should not be held back or provided less opportunity, respect or protections under the law because of their gender. This is not a partisan issue but one of universal human rights. Gender equality should be an explicit, basic principle of our society.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Alaska for her eloquent remarks, and I am glad I was here to have a chance to listen to them, both on equal rights, really, for all Americans. It is not possible for us to speak on any subject today without recognizing what is going on in the country.

A couple of comments that come to my mind as I think what happened as a result of the incident with George Floyd in Minneapolis were, first, the comment of the leader of the peaceful protest in Nashville. There were more than 1,000 there. She said, the next day, that she was disappointed by the rioters and looters because they dishonored the memory of George Floyd and dishonored the peaceful protest against racial discrimination. I thought she said that well and expressed the feeling of most Tennesseans.

The other comment I thought about was that of our colleague Senator TIM

SCOTT of South Carolina, who is one of three African-American Members of the U.S. Senate. He told us a couple of years ago in a private Bible study—and I asked him later if I could mention it—that he was stopped 7 times—an African-American man—in his hometown, Charleston, SC, for being a Black man in the wrong place, even while he was the vice mayor of his hometown.

I asked him about that again this week. He said: Yes, it happened again last month. I think most of us don't know that. We don't think about that—those of us who aren't African American, aren't Black. To think about that, I think, helps us begin the process of understanding the feelings that are going on in the country right now, most of which can't be solved by laws. They will have to be changed by attitudes.

GOING BACK TO COLLEGE SAFELY

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to make comments on two other subjects. The first is about a subject that is concerning about 70, 75 million American families; that is, going back to college and going back to school. The question is on the minds of many Americans: Will we be going back to college? Will our children be going back to school?

We finished a hearing today—the Presiding Officer was present; the Senator from Alaska was present—on going back to college safely. The question is not whether we are going back to college in the United States of America; the question is how to go back safely. We all understand that when 70, 75 million students go back to college and go back to school, that is the surest sign that American life is regaining its rhythm—not just for the students themselves but, especially with the children, for their parents, most of whom work outside the home.

Today's subject was about college. We had excellent witnesses. We had Mitch Daniels, the president of Purdue University. He was introduced by the Senator from Indiana. We had the president of Brown University, Christina Paxson. We had Logan Hampton, who was president of a small historically Black college in Jackson, TN, Lane College. And we had the President of American Public Health Association, Dr. Benjamin. They talked with us about the various strategies and concerns that existed.

I will, in a few minutes, ask consent to put my opening statement in the RECORD, but if I can summarize it, it would be this. Most of our 6,000 public colleges and universities—some public, some private, some church schools—will be open in August for in-person students but not all of them. The University of California State system has said so far that it expects only to offer online courses. But at Purdue, for example—an institution of 55,000 students—President Daniels has decided, with the approval of his board, and

President Paxson of Brown—a different kind of institution in the Northeast, different from Purdue—they both decided it is their obligation to open up and to create a safe environment for the students to come back.

There are several reasons for this. There is some health risk in coming back. Of course, wise leadership can address that. But I think, as all of us have looked at our colleges, wise leadership can make colleges among the safest communities to live and work in America over the next year because colleges have certain advantages. In the first place, most of the campus community is young. While we can't be cavalier about the effect of COVID-19 on young people, as Dr. Fauci has warned us, the fact is that COVID-19 seems to hurt the young much less.

The second reason it would be easier to go back to college is that there is a lot of space in colleges that isn't used. Colleges are the most notorious wasters of space in our society. It is rare that a class is taught in the early morning or late evening or on Saturdays or in the summers. There is plenty of time and plenty of space to spread out on most college campuses.

As we learn more and more about COVID-19, it looks like there are three things we really need to do: Keep 6 feet apart, wash our hands, and wear a mask. Do those three things, and we can probably go back to school, back to work, out to eat, and do most of the things we would like to do.

At a college, as President Daniels says, he intends to develop a culture of masks. Vanderbilt University is going to require a mask to be worn in all indoor situations. Then they are taking a number of other steps. Concerts and parties and large gatherings are out. Flu shots and grab-and-go meals are in.

There will be systematic testing, and testing will be done in different ways. The president of Brown would like to test every student, she said in an article in the New York Times a few weeks ago.

The president of Purdue said: Well, maybe systematic testing. There will be different strategies for testing, but the goal of testing is two things. One is containing the disease; that is, identifying the sick and the exposed so that they can be quarantined so the rest of us don't have to be, and the other is to build confidence.

I know that when I took a test last week after I was exposed to COVID-19, I went home for 2 weeks of self-isolation, as the attending physician said I should do. That should have been it, but I went to my local public health department and took a test, which turned out to be negative, for peace of mind. It gave me more confidence to go back home and be with my family.

The anticipation is that there will be plenty of testing. Admiral Giroir, the Assistant Secretary of Public Health, has told our committee, we are, in the United States, doing about 10 million tests a month now. States are submit-

ting to the Federal Government a plan each month about their testing needs. The Federal Government is helping fill in any gaps. Over the next 2, 3 months, the number of tests will go from about 10 million a month to 40 or 50 million tests a month. That is a lot of tests. We are already testing more than any country in the world.

My guess is that colleges and universities—even though there are 6,000 of them, 127 different institutions in Tennessee—if they will be in touch with their Governor and be a part of the State testing plan, they can have adequate tests, not only to contain the disease and isolate those who should be isolated but to give peace of mind to other students and faculty and members of the community who come on-board.

Finally, we talked a little bit about the role of the Federal Government. We have a classic discussion about that here. Some want to say Washington should do it; some want to say the State should do it. Generally, our friends on the Democratic side trust Washington, DC; generally, we on the Republican side trust the States. But there is a role for both. The Federal Government, through the Centers for Disease Control, can provide advice. The Federal Government, as it is doing through the Shark Tank, as we call it, at the National Institutes of Health, can accelerate the number of rapid tests that are available at a low cost for campuses.

The Federal Government can provide additional funding for campuses, as we did in the CARES Act. Those are some of the things we can do from here. But the things we ought not to try to do from here are to order California to open its campuses if California doesn't want to or to tell Purdue and Notre Dame and Brown and the University of Tennessee and Vanderbilt that they cannot open their campuses if they do want to and think they can do it safely. We should not be trying to tell each of those campuses exactly how many tests they have, what kind of tests they have, any more than we try to tell them what the faculty ought to be paid or what student admissions policies ought to be or what the curriculum ought to be.

While the Federal Government needs to create an umbrella in which individual campuses can go back to school safely, we need to be careful about telling everybody exactly what to do.

We had a very big event here 4, 5 years ago when we fixed No Child Left Behind. Everybody wanted it fixed—Democrats, Republicans, labor unions, Governors, teachers. Why? Because after a while, everybody got tired of Washington, DC, telling 100,000 public schools exactly what to do, what teachers to hire, what curriculum to have—all of these things. The same is true with our colleges.

Our system of colleges and universities is the best in the world. Everyone concedes that. It has not gotten