

FROM: THE OFFICE OF U.S. SENATOR BOB DOLE
NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510
(202) 225-6521

568

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

WASHINGTON, D.C., Oct. 13, 1970 -- U.S. Senator Bob Dole (R-Kans.) today expressed his concern over the so-called "Equal Right" of women to be required to serve in compulsory military service on the same basis as men.

Dole said, in a statement on the Senate floor, that he was pleased to be a cosponsor of the Equal Rights Amendment, S.J. RES. 61 and that he had been an advocate of a similar measure while in the House of Representatives, but that he had recently supported a bill designed to end compulsory military service for men and that it would be "anomalous at this time to support a Constitutional Amendment that too easily lends itself to an interpretation requiring compulsory military service or even combat duty for women."

Dole said, "Certainly, the simplest way to prevent women from becoming liable to the draft would be to accept the proposed language of Senator Ervin's amendment."

He explained, "There is nothing in this amendment that would prohibit Congress, during a period of grave national emergency, from conscripting women if such action were determined to be necessary to maintenance of national security. But this amendment simply prohibits the invalidation of any present law which exempts women from compulsory service."

"This amendment in no way abridges the inherent rights of any women, but clearly delineates current national policy of exempting women from the draft."

The Kansas Senator said that the amendment would encourage women to serve in the military by guaranteeing promotion rights and salary raises consistent with those enjoyed by men.

Dole concluded, "It would seem that every Senator who favors the Equal Rights Amendment would want to make his intent perfectly clear and vote for Senator Ervin's amendment."

STATEMENT OF U.S. SENATOR BOB DOLE
ON THE SENATE FLOOR
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1970

569

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

President Nixon's veto of S. 3637, a bill to revise provisions of the Communications Act relating to political broadcasting was not -- as some have charged -- a "ducking of the issue."

Rather, the President faced the issue head on and arrived at the only equitable decision.

The bill was discriminatory, unrealistic and would not have meant less campaign spending.

The bill would have limited spending on only radio and television. Spending on other forms of political advertising -- newspaper advertising, direct mailings, balloons and buttons would not have been affected.

Indeed, had the bill been approved, spending on the latter items would have undoubtedly increased greatly to make up for the lack of direct radio-television communication with the voters.

The limitation on the amount of money that could be spent for broadcasting in general elections did not take into account the great disparity in the amounts charged for broadcast time in various parts of the country.

As the President pointed out, 30 seconds of prime television time in New York City costs \$3,500. In the Wichita-Hutchinson area of my own state, that amount of time costs \$145.

The high cost of campaigning needs to be curbed -- but S. 3637 is not the answer.

I voted against the bill when it came before the Senate and will vote to sustain the President's veto.