



NEWS from U.S. Senator Bob Dole

(R.—Kans.)

New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510 (202) 225-6521

Joe Reppert—Press Secretary

For release: 3/2/72

Washington, D.C., August 2, 1972 ---- Senator Bob Dole today announced that he would introduce an amendment to the so-called Cranston-Brooke "end the war amendment". This amendment would provide formal congressional declaration of responsibility for the consequences of the end the war amendment policy. The amendment reads as follows:

Provided, that the Congress of the United States hereby accepts and assumes full responsibility for the consequences of the policy established by this section.

Senator Dole's statement on the amendment follows:

RESPONSIBILITY FOR AUTHORITY

"Mr. President, the amendment I offer is brief, direct and clear. It is an attempt to place things in proper perspective--for the benefit of Congress and for the benefit of the American people.

The amendment simply provides that the Congress accept and assume full responsibility for the consequences of the policy established by the latest so-called end the war amendment.

BASIC ISSUE

The issue at hand today has been considered by the Senate and the House on numerous occasions. It has been worded differently. It has been framed in numerous contexts. It has been described in various ways. But the basic issue has remained the same.

Some have said the issue is ending the Vietnam war. Some have said that it is an overdue assertion of Congress-

(more)

ional prerogatives. Some have said the issue is peace--peace, now. Some have said it is a matter of sharing burdens with the President. But the Senator from Kansas does not agree.

The Senator from Kansas believes that the issue, when stripped of its camouflage and window dressing and decoration, is very simple--who is going to conduct the foreign relations of the United States and who is going to be the Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces: the President or the Congress?

The Senator from Kansas holds one view on this issue. Other Senators may agree, some may disagree. We have varying views--which is our right. And there is no suggestion that anyone is not entitled to see an issue--whatever it may be--in differing lights.

CLEAR CONSTITUTIONAL ROLES

The Senator from Kansas believes the Constitution clearly makes the the President our Commander in Chief and provides him authority to conduct our foreign relations. He further reads the Constitution as providing the Congress--particularly the Senate--with a meaningful role in helping shape foreign policy and dealing with the military. The Congress has legislative oversight of the President's foreign policy and military programs and of course holds the purse strings through the appropriations process. The Senate has advise and consent powers over state and Defense Department appointments, including Ambassadors and military officers. These powers in the check-and-balance structure of the Constitution give the Legislative branch a substantial and substantive voice in military and foreign policy. The Senator from Kansas believes that the Congress has responsibilities in these areas, has a role to play and should exercise its powers as it sees fit. The Senator from Kansas sees this role, he recognizes it; and he supports it.

But at the same time, there would seem no possible reading or stretching or construction that could be given the Constitution to vest in Congress any authority to conduct the Nation's foreign relations or to exercise the powers of the Commander-in-Chief. These functions and duties are in the realm of the President.

Now, this is the view of the Senator from Kansas, who believes it is supported by the text of the Constitution and the judicial and historical precedents which have been established over the years.

But perhaps there are grounds for opposing views; perhaps there is room for disagreement. The Senator from Kansas does not think so, but he is willing to admit of the possibility.

But if the Congress, by majority vote decides that the Senator from Kansas' view is not well taken, and if the Congress decides that it wishes to direct the course of our foreign policy and bestow upon itself the role of Commander-in-Chief--then let it do so. We are here to decide, to vote, to make choices.

SUCCESSFUL PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP

The Senator from Kansas does not believe it is necessary for Congress to adapt such a policy, nor

would it be wise. We have a President. The Constitution has provided him authority to conduct his office. And he is fulfilling his office with great courage and dignity--and with significant results for the interests of the United States and the course of world peace.

The President has made a substantial record at home, abroad, and especially in Southeast Asia. When he entered his office in 1969, he inherited a raging war, without a plan to end it. More than 540,000 Americans were fighting the war in Vietnam and suffering casualties of 300 per week.

What has he accomplished in three and a half years? More than half a million servicemen have been withdrawn, and casualties have been reduced by 95 percent. The South Vietnamese have taken over nearly the entire burden of defending their nation on the ground. And our nation is pursuing a broad and eminently reasonable plan for peace in Indochina--a peace plan that has been pursued at every possible level and with tireless dedication.

Now, this is hardly a record of shortfall or failure. It is one of achievement and fulfillment for which the President deserves considerable support. And it is a record which in conjunction with his other foreign policy initiatives and domestic policies he will take to the people in the course of his reelection campaign. It is certainly not a record which suggests an invitation for Congress to pick up the reins of power from a listless and ineffective executive. To the contrary--and whether Congress chooses to recognize it or not--the past three and a half years are unique in the vigorous and energetic approaches that our National leadership has taken to the challenges and difficulties that confront this nation.

RESPONSIBILITY GOES WITH AUTHORITY

But if Congress is going to declare itself the Director of American foreign policy and assume the role of Commander-in-Chief, it should not do so by half measures. It should not take just a half a loaf. It should not merely grab the glory and leave the hard and difficult and unpopular part of the package behind.

If Congress wants the authority, let it also shoulder the responsibility. It is only fair. After all, the Constitution places the responsibility on the President. It is customary in law and government that authority and responsibility go together. So if the Congress wants authority, it should be honest enough to own up to the responsibility. He has said he expects to be held accountable for the results of his policies. So if Congress is intent upon this course, let it recognize the obligation that goes with the authority. And let it follow the President's example and declare to the American people that it accepts responsibility for the policy it would impose.

LET CONGRESS ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY

Let Congress accept responsibility for the enemy's holdout at the Paris peace negotiations and further months of war. Let Congress accept responsibility for the men held prisoner throughout Indochina and the missing in action as they face prolongation of their miserable status.

Let Congress pursue this exercise and assume responsibility for the 30- or 40 thousand soldiers who are still in Vietnam and facing the enemy, and for the sailors and airmen who fly into the combat zones.

Let Congress assume responsibility for the confidence of our allies--in Asia, in Europe, in the Middle East--as they see the comittment of three Presidents voided and our nation's solemn pledge revoked.

Let Congress bear the responsibility for undoing the Guam Doctrine, and with it the world's hopes for a sound structure of a just and lasting peace.

Let Congress bear the responsibility for the emptiness of one-thousand per cent worthless American credibility as a major power.

FACE UP TO REALITIES

So I call upon the Senate to face up to the realities of the course it would chart for America. Put Congress on the line with the public as to where the responsibility for this policy should lie and who should lie and who should be held accountable for it.

Let the Congress be honest with itself and with the public, and let this amendment be adopted.