

Portland State University

PDXScholar

---

Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers

Special Collections and University Archives

---

10-22-1970

## "Address to Faculty and Students Discussing Current Political and Social Issues"

George Stanley McGovern

Robert Straub

Kay Corbett

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/orspeakers>



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

---

### Recommended Citation

McGovern, George Stanley; Straub, Robert; and Corbett, Kay, "Address to Faculty and Students Discussing Current Political and Social Issues" (1970). *Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers*. 165.  
<https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/orspeakers/165>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Special Collections: Oregon Public Speakers by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

“Address to Faculty and Students Discussing Current Political and Social Issues”

George Stanley McGovern

October 22, 1970

Portland State University

Portland State University Library Special Collections & University Archives

Oregon Public Speakers Collection

<http://archives.pdx.edu/ds/psu/11410>

Transcribed by Dasani Mitchell and Carolee Harrison, Spring/Summer 2024

*PSU Library Special Collections and University Archives presents these recordings as part of the historical record. They reflect the recollections and opinions of the individual speakers and are not intended to be representative of the views of Portland State University. They may contain language, ideas, or stereotypes that are offensive to others.*

KAY CORBETT: Citizens, students from many colleges and high schools in the area, it gives me a great pleasure to welcome you to Portland State University. You are here speaking—these distinguished guests are speaking from a platform where yesterday Portland State University heard for the first time a head of government in the world. President Gregory Wolfe is out of town and he wishes to extend his greetings both to you and to these distinguished guests. I am Kay Corbett and an administrator here, and tonight it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you a friend and a devoted public servant. Bob Straub is the most effective and hardest-working treasurer that Oregon has had in recent years and perhaps ever. Bob Straub is honest, a rare virtue; Bob Straub is hard-working—action instead of talk is what we’ve found out about Bob Straub. All the Democrats, and many more, look forward to his service as the next governor of the state of Oregon. Robert Straub. [applause]

ROBERT STRAUB: Thank you very much, Kay Corbett; Senator McGovern; National Committee man Blaine Whipple; wonderful students at Portland State University, and faculty. Three cheers! Oregon is honored in having the visit of a man with the credentials and the courage of Senator McGovern come up to the Northwest, and I am honored to have a man of this caliber come here to support me in my campaign. I want to say that the kind of things that Senator McGovern has worked for in the Senate and has worked for in Congress before he was elected to the Senate are the kind of things that all of us feel are things that are drastically, urgently needed in this country. He not only has been a champion of the cause for peace, he not only is a co-author of the Hatfield-McGovern amendment to end the war—which incidentally in his home state of South Dakota is known as McGovern-Hatfield amendment to end the war—but he also has fought hard for

shifting priorities and has fought hard for alleviating the problems and the causes of hunger. He serves as chairman of the Senate Select Committee on hunger. Senator McGovern is traveling all over this country trying to help Democrats be elected to office, and I want to say that I'm very pleased and very honored to have him appear in Oregon in my behalf and the behalf of Kay Corbett, who is running for the legislature from East Central, and in behalf of other Democratic candidates who are seeking office. With that, I introduce to you with great honor and pride the senator from South Dakota, Senator George McGovern. [applause]

GEORGE McGOVERN: Thank you very much, Bob Straub and Mrs. Corbett, Mr. Whipple, students, faculty, and guests at Portland University. First, let me begin by saying that every one of us who has been around the country over the last couple of weeks is always grateful for any kind of friendly welcome. We've just had the Vice President in our state. [laughter] He picked Sioux Falls, South Dakota as the place to give his refutation to the Scranton Commission on campus unrest. But in the course of those remarks, he also had some rather choice things to say about me. Among other things, he described me as a "hysterical hypochondriac of history." [laughter] I can't help, as I watch the Vice President moving around the country, recalling an incident that took place about 10 years ago when Lyndon Johnson was debating whether he ought to accept the vice-presidential nomination. And he went to John Nance Garner of Texas, who had held that job for two terms with President Roosevelt, and he said, "Do you really think I ought to take it?" And Garner said, "Lyndon, that job ain't worth a pitcher of lukewarm spit." Well, I've come to the conclusion that that must be the goal by which the present occupant is judging the office. [applause]

[00:06:16]

I picked up a little book on the Vice President the other day that some of you may have seen called *The Wit and Wisdom of Spiro T. Agnew*. It costs a dollar, and as some of you know who have opened the covers of that book, while it has about 75 or 80 pages, every one of them is blank, except for the foreword. It was written by a man by the name of Nathaniel Lee, and it reads as follows: "When small men cast big shadows, it is a sure sign the sun is setting." [applause] Right?

I think that, in a very serious way, calls to mind a story that is also true that goes back to the days of Benjamin Franklin at the conclusion of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, when that document was written. He addressed the other delegates who were there, and he said, "Gentlemen, I've been watching over the course of these deliberations a picture that hangs at the front of this auditorium which shows the sun setting on the horizon." And he said several times, "I've wondered whether the artist meant that picture to depict a setting sun or a rising sun. But I would like to think, in view of the principles that we have written into this document, that as far as our new country is

concerned, it is a rising sun.” Now, I think 200 years later, in the closing days of what may turn out to be a very fateful campaign, when we are deciding, in many races, the tone of our country, that we have to ask that question again: whether we're going through a period when the sun is rising on the people of the United States, or whether, indeed, this is a time when the sun is setting.

We're going to observe, in the middle of this decade, the 200th anniversary of the American Revolution, a revolution that was consecrated by its architects to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And it would seem to me that the best possible way we can observe that historic anniversary is by re-consecrating ourselves in a second peaceful revolution that is dedicated to those same goals: dedicated to turning away from death to life, turning away from repression to liberty, turning away from poverty and misery and racism and neglect to a genuine pursuit of happiness.

[00:09:22] And I should like to suggest to this audience tonight, as one who has moved about the country a great deal over the past few years and has had the privilege of being on many, many college campuses in every part of this nation; who has had the opportunity to discuss the basic principles and problems that confront our country in churches, synagogues, and union halls, and various areas across the nation with people that have been wondering about what the future held for us, that I can't think of any fundamental evil that faces this nation today that wouldn't be healed by a genuine, honest application of the principles in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights.

What is it that the most thoughtful critics today are trying to say to us? Are they not calling us to a reaffirmation of the goals with which we began? Are they not saying: turn away from a crusade in Asia to the healing of your own country? Are they not saying to us that before we talk about self-determination for the people of Vietnam, we ought to get our own selves together? Are they not saying that this nation began with a lofty set of goals that demands the best in each one of us if we're going to close this terribly painful gap between what it is we say we stand for in the United States and what we actually do?

Now, we can be thankful that young and old alike in the United States, at least some people in this country, have had the courage to stand up against what they believe to be a departure from the best in the American tradition. And it is those very people who are calling not only for peace abroad, but calling for reconciliation and justice here in our own society who have been singled out by the Vice President of the United States for all of these long, fancy terms which he summarizes under the name “radical liberals.” Well, in one sense of the word, there is something radical about calling for a restructuring of American priorities and American policies. And it's going to take a very dramatic and profound change indeed if we right the course of this nation and by 1976 come up to the kind of goals with which we began some 200 years ago. And yet I would

like to suggest to you this evening that in a very profound sense of the word, what we are really calling the nation to do is to conserve and to redeem the most enduring sources of its national strength.

[00:12:40]

I remember back in 1960, in the course of that presidential campaign, Mr. Nixon was challenged in that race by the then Senator John F. Kennedy. And at one stage in the course of the televised debates that I've always thought decided the outcome of that presidential contest, one of the news commentators said that he would like to direct the same question to each candidate. The question was: "What do you regard as the most important single asset that commends you to the presidency of the United States?" And Mr. Nixon, who answered first in the one minute that he was allowed, said that he thought his experience as Vice President, as a member of the House, a member of the Senate, constituted a unique qualification for the presidency.

And we had not heard very much at that time from Senator Kennedy about his national goals. And everyone here knows that he was later to make mistakes of a very costly nature, as well as to do some things that we're still very proud of. But on that night, I was wondering how he would respond to that question. And I saw him struggling with it as he waited for his turn to come before the television networks of the nation, knowing full well that millions of people were waiting for his answer. And as I recall it, he said, "I believe if there is any one qualification that might stand me in good stead as a candidate for the presidency of this country, it would be my sense of history." By that, he said: I mean the capacity to understand the underlying forces and ideals and principles that have brought this country to a position of influence and power in the world. But perhaps more important than that, a capacity to understand what it is that is important in our own day so that we can know what those things are that we should stand for and what we should stand against.

And as I think about the decade that stretches out ahead of us now, some ten years later, it seems to me even more profoundly important tonight that we ask this question of what kind of country we want to be, what kind of a society we want to be, and what the qualities are that we need in the leadership of the United States and in the leadership of our country to move us in that direction.

[00:15:32]

As I indicated a moment ago, I found in no place that I've been in this country and in no group any more dramatic or more drastic prescription for healing the basic problems of our country than I find in the writings of these early founding documents, in the phrases of men like Paine and Jefferson and Adams and Lincoln and others. But what I do find is a very great and powerful nation that has wandered so far away from those ideals that it has

almost lost its way. I found an America that was established on the principle of the sacredness of human life; that for many years has been contaminating the very basis of life by threatening this fragile psychological and ecological balance of man's environment. I find an America which launched its own independence with a respect, a decent respect, for the opinions of mankind—that for ten years has been floundering in the mud and blood of Southeast Asia in open defiance of the opinion of the civilized world. [applause] Thank you.

[00:17:12] President Nixon visited that part of the world about a year ago and pronounced our experience in Vietnam as the finest hour in our national history. I would like to say here tonight that it was the worst hour in our national history. [applause] On that same tour to Asia, he said of General Thiệu, the leader of the regime that we have been backing in Saigon, that he represents one of the three or four great political leaders of our time. I think most of the people in this auditorium would agree that he's one of the three or four worst. [applause]

I've tried as best I could as a member of the Senate to understand what the concept of Vietnamization means, that the president has held out for us. As I understand it, what it really means is that we will continue to supply the weapons of death and destruction, and whatever logistical support is needed in the way of American manpower and materiel in an effort to keep the Vietnamese killing each other. Not so much because anyone longer believes that our decision was right to intervene, but because there are still men in very high places in this government who are more interested in saving face than they are in saving lives. Now... [applause]

So, the purpose of the so-called Hatfield-McGovern amendment was to try to call this nation away from that venture. It was to try to do something else that we never should have lost in the first place, and that is the constitutional responsibility that the Congress has to maintain some control over the issues of war and peace. And so I would call here tonight for our country to come home from the killing of Asians to the healing of our own land. I find in America, whose early pioneers opened the doors of Harvard College within six years after they landed at Massachusetts Bay, that now some 300 years later says that while we can afford \$75 billion for the weapons of destruction, we cannot afford adequate funding for the schools and the educational institutions of this nation. [applause]

[00:20:19]

Bob Straub made reference to the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs which I've had the privilege to chair. Let me tell you how that commission got started. Some two and a half years ago, the CBS network did a study, a documentary film, on the problem of hunger in America. It was the first time that any one of our major news-gathering organizations had really focused the attention that that problem deserves. And there was a little reason for that. There was a little incident that I saw on the television

screen in my living room as that documentary unfolded, where the camera came to play on a little boy, perhaps eight or nine years of age, who was standing in a school lunchroom in one of our states, watching the other children eat their lunch. He was unable to eat, because under the rules of that school, if you didn't have the cash to pay for the meal, there was no provision to take care of the lunch. And yet, in one of those curious disciplinary rules that afflicts some parts of the country, he was required to go with the other students and stand in the school lunchroom during the school lunch hour. Now, this is not an isolated case, unfortunately. And the television reporter walked up to this boy and asked him what he thought when he had to stand there day after day around the edge of the room, watching the other youngsters eat. And I had thought that he would say he was angry, or something of that kind, but he hung his head and in a barely audible voice, he said, "I'm ashamed." And when the reporter asked him why, he said, "Because I haven't got any money." Now, I think in a country as rich and as powerful as this, it is not that little boy who should be ashamed, but each one of us who permits that kind of situation to exist.

But I find, unfortunately, an America that has not only permitted that kind of cruel paradox to exist; I find a country that began with an affirmation that all men are created equal—and in the days of the women's liberation, that means all women as well. That all of us... [applause] that all people are created equal; it began with that affirmation. Still, after all the tragedy of racism and hatred that stems from it, permitting children to be penalized because of the color of their skin. I find, even in my own state, an America that depended—at least the early settlers did—on the friendship and the cooperation of the First Americans who were here. Now these many years, having gradually shoved those people onto miserable reservations, into the slums around our Indian communities, until those who were once the first Americans have become the last Americans.

I find an America that began with an affirmation about the importance of happiness, about the right of every individual to seek happiness, still permitting six million families in this country to live in the kind of miserable hovels where no human being ought to live. Seven million old people still living on less than \$100 a month. Try that at a time of inflation of the kind that we're moving through today. Five million people without jobs, and God only knows how many others who are not on the statistics. So I find an America that opened its arms over the past 150 years to millions of people from all over the globe, including immigrants who came here fleeing compulsory military conscription in the old world, now watching their sons drafted and sent off to a war they regard as both foolish and barbaric. [applause]

[00:25:16]

So, before opening myself up to questions here tonight, I want to do what I've done so many times before, and to call upon this country of ours to come home from the

destruction and death in which we're involved some 10,000 miles away from our shore, and get on with the redemption and the healing of these terrible problems and divisions here in our own country. I want to call upon America to come home from the bitterness of racism to the simple dignity and brotherhood of man. I would like to call on our country to come away from what we've seen too much of in the politics of manipulation and cynicism, to a politics of hope and reconciliation. I would like to ask this country to come home from political intimidation and conspiracy trials to the spirit and letter of the Constitution. I would like to ask us to come home, most of all, to the kind of a community where we really care about one another as human beings. That, it seems to me, is what is most urgently needed of all.

And what I suppose I resent most deeply about the leadership personified so dramatically by Mr. Agnew is that he appeals to none of these aspirations that I've expressed here tonight. At a time when we need a leadership of healing, a leadership of reconciliation, a leadership that lifts the best that is within us, how sad it is that our national leaders are appealing to what is fearful and mean and base within the people of our country. What we need most of all is a leadership that lifts the spirit and the heart and the goals of the people of this country. So tonight, let us rededicate ourselves to peace and to the healing of our nation, knowing full well that that is the best way home for the people of America. Thank you very much. [applause]

[00:28:05]

STRAUB: Thank you very much, Senator, for that heartwarming and genuine and forceful message this evening. The senator has indicated that he'd like to open this up now and to have any questions from any of you that you wish to ask. Senator, would you like to present... ?

McGOVERN: I have a little trouble seeing the audience because of the bright lights, but if you'll come out somewhere here near the center or else wave your hand until I see you, I'll be glad to take a few minutes for anything you'd like to address from the floor.

QUESTION: I'd like to know what you're doing for women. [laughter and applause]

McGOVERN: Well, I'd like to do a lot more. [laughter and applause] In all seriousness, I've done what little I could as one of the early co-sponsors of the Equal Rights Amendment, which I'm confident we are going to pass in the Congress. It's regrettable that the Senate of the United States permitted this recess to take place without acting on that and some of the other measures that were pending. But as you know, it passed the House by a very substantial margin, and I have no doubt that it will clear the Senate of the United States. That should be an important step forward in the direction of affirming the equal rights of women in our society. It's one that's favored by the leaders of most of the



groups that speak for women in this country. There is some opposition to it, but in general, I think it's the one thing the Congress of the United States can do that will be helpful in redressing the balance.

QUESTION: Thank you.

[another question asked off-microphone, inaudible; some laughter]

McGOVERN: Well, he spent a lot more time attacking senators outside of the chamber than he has presiding over the Senate inside, that I can assure you. The latest statistics I've seen is that out of the first 1,000 hours that the Senate was in session, he was there 1.5% of the time, which is not a very impressive record. I might say I haven't seen him in the Senate for two or three months. He's been out full-time, but beyond that, the Vice President of the United States has some other responsibilities. He's the chairman of the Youth Opportunities Council. [audience reacts] I thought this would reassure you... [laughter] here tonight, and let me say this—I don't know whether this is good news or bad—he has yet to call a meeting of that council, but it makes me think as I look over the various... he also heads up the council on the study of the oceans; what's the— oceanography. He heads up the committee that's supposed to put this country out in front in long-range programs and short-range programs with reference to the oceans. He has yet to call a meeting of that group, so it makes one wonder after all if maybe there isn't something to this old fear that a guaranteed income may discourage labor, particularly when you get up to \$62,000 a year.

[question asked in background]

McGOVERN: Well, if we are going to continue this costly war, which I'm opposed to, we ought to recognize that the only way you're going to end inflation is by putting on wage and price controls. There's no other way you can fight a war without some degree of control—perhaps selective controls on key industries, on oil and automobiles, aluminum, copper, some of these other things that are basic elements in the economy. And I agree with those economists who've said that you cannot control inflation by the techniques that are being used by the administration, which consist of raising interest rates and slowing down construction, which has the effect of throwing people out of work. That's a terribly painful way to try to deal with the problem of inflation. So if the war is going to continue—and I sincerely hope it won't—we're going to have to go to selective wage and price controls. We should have done it five or six years ago.

QUESTION: I'd like to know what your position on the Middle East is.

McGOVERN: I think in the Middle East you have the one area where the administration has

done pretty well. I've been a severe critic of administration policy both domestically and in Southeast Asia, and while everyone can think of some minor area where the policy might have been improved in the Middle East, I think on balance the administration has done a pretty good job in handling a very difficult situation there.

The basic thrust of our policy as I understand it has been to try to bring the two conflicting sides together at the conference table to arrange a ceasefire and a standstill, and then to get them talking about the basis of a settlement, and to use the good offices of the United Nations as a means of assisting and bringing that about. I think under the circumstances, while it's a very shaky and uncertain operation, that I cannot really fault the administration in their handling of the Mid-East crisis.

QUESTION: Senator McGovern, I wanted to know what you thought of Mr. Mitchell's speech yesterday when you talked about vigilante groups, as far as law and order goes.

McGOVERN: Well I—of course I deplore that kind of talk. I can't imagine the chief law enforcement officer of the land welcoming a return to the vigilantes. We went through a period in our history when we depended on that kind of law enforcement. It didn't work out very well. And I would hope that instead of that, the Attorney General would get behind some of the more thoughtful proposals that have been made by members of the Congress to upgrade the quality of our law enforcement. I think we need a whole range of training and re-education programs that are designed to equip law enforcement people to deal with the much more complex and difficult questions that face us today. I would rather see Mr. Mitchell addressing himself to the problem in that fashion rather than appealing to private citizens to organize themselves into vigilante groups.

QUESTION: Mr. McGovern. You were said by Mrs. Corbett to be a man of great courage. I have to congratulate you for your courage, because for a peace candidate, to stand before millions of people on the radio and say that you support Nixon's plan in Vietnam takes great courage indeed. Now, just a question. How can you give the legal stamp of approval of the Senate—which you led the majority resolution to favor Nixon's plan—how can you give the legal stamp of approval...

McGOVERN: What resolution?

QUESTION: Nixon's speech where he last came out... which the Senate unanimously declared its support for.

McGOVERN: I don't think I led any movement to...

QUESTION: Oh, I just heard you on the radio and I wanted a comment on that. OK, but I

just wanted to ask you a question. That is: how can you have voted for that plan? How can you vote for the maintenance of American troops in Vietnam one more day? Why don't you call for an immediate withdrawal of Vietnam? If you say the United States is wrong in Vietnam, why don't you call for immediate withdrawal? This is puzzling me.

McGOVERN: Well, I'm for immediate withdrawal.

QUESTION: Why don't you vote for it?

McGOVERN: I have voted for it. I voted against the entire military appropriation the last two times for precisely that reason. [applause] Let me suggest this to you: the most practical way of restoring some measure of Congressional control over this war was the amendment that Senator Hatfield and I proposed on the day before the Cambodian invasion. If he and I had our way about it, American forces would be extricated from Vietnam just as quickly as we could bring them home, but what we were trying to appeal for in that amendment is a kind of a formula that would get 50 or 51 members of the United States Senate that would stand up and say that at such-and-such a date, that's the end. No more. And we carefully devised that amendment in such a way as to achieve maximum strength in the Senate without betraying our own essential principles.

Personally, I am very proud of that effort. We didn't win, but it was a constructive effort that was worth undertaking. It had something to do with forcing the quick withdrawal of American forces from Cambodia; it had something to do with the President's own stance, which has moved a little closer to a sensible negotiating position than he was a year ago; and while nothing that we've attempted to do in the Senate has worked out exactly the way I hoped it would, I think we can be very proud of the efforts we made in the McGovern-Hatfield amendment. [applause]

[00:38:58]

QUESTION: Senator, the question I'd like to ask is in some sense addressed to Mr. Straub also. In our state, Mr. Straub has been one of the leaders for lessening the degree of unconcern evidenced in large business and governmental organizations for the deteriorating environment, and you and Senator Muskie in the Senate have performed a similar role. A large utility in this area is about to get away with plans to build a more than one-million-kilowatt nuclear power project less than fifty miles from here on an earthquake fault zone. There's supposed to be—I would assume over a dozen separate types of approval for this type of thing, all of which seem to be falling in line under the presiding of our current governor Mr. McCall. I was wondering if either you or Mr. Straub could suggest measures that can be taken at the state level, at the federal level, and especially in coordination between the two, to prevent this type of thing from happening. Even our own conservative newspapers have denounced the speed with which this thing is going through.

McGOVERN: I'll let... I'll comment on it first, and then turn the microphone to Mr. Straub if he wishes to comment. I of course don't know anything about the specific instance here, but I do know about similar problems in every state in the union. I have felt that what is lacking in our environmental machinery is a legal right to institute citizens' suits against polluters, whether they are government agencies that are doing the polluting or private industry or private individuals. The state of Michigan has passed such a law that gives the individual citizen the legal right to file suit in the courts to tie up a development that he regards as damaging to the environment, or to take legal action against somebody already polluting the environment, until the courts have had an opportunity to pass judgement on it. We modified that bill somewhat, but it pretty much is the same legislation, and we've introduced it in the Senate of the United States. Senator Hart of Michigan and I are the principal sponsors. Hearings have already been held in the Senate; we're going to press very hard for passage of that legislation. I think there's a reasonable chance that we can get it through. But it's one tool that we desperately need to deal with the kind of situation that you've just described. Mr. Straub, do you care to comment on this?

STRAUB: Thank you. I'll make it very brief, but what I believe is that the people of Portland and the people of Oregon are entitled to every protection that is available at this time. The firm contract for the generator is led by PGE. Westinghouse Power Company, through their president Mr. Simpson, has announced to the *Wall Street Journal* that Westinghouse Power now has the capability of manufacturing an emission-free nuclear reactor. It'll cost more money—it'll cost PGE about a million dollars more money to install the latest machinery in this plant. I think the people of Portland and of Oregon are entitled to have PGE install and require the latest technological achievements in this field. This is what I feel.

There is time for two more to ask the senator.

McGOVERN: Can I add one more thing before we get into these last two questions? I am convinced that we can do a lot more on the environmental front than we have, in a much shorter length of time than some people believe. The auto industry, which is perhaps the single principal polluter in the country today, has complained bitterly that they can't possibly develop by 1975 an emission-free exhaust system. But last summer, a group of students at MIT developed a car on their own, with the help of the faculty and the technicians at that school, drove it from Boston to California—they produced the car for less money than some of those that are operating on the road today; it's a serviceable automobile, and it meets an even higher standard than the legislation recently passed in the Congress of the United States. So there is a way to get on top of this pollution problem, and we've got to accelerate the degree of urgency with which we move against it.

Now, two more questions.

QUESTION: Yes. One: I understand part of your amendment was to get the power back to the Senate to control the war, rather than the president. But aside from that, your own feelings for the war—suppose you had that power; exactly when would every single troop be home? Exactly when would every single dollar, every single gun that we're putting into Vietnam and Southeast Asia, exactly when would you bring all of that home?

McGOVERN: Well, I'd do it just as fast as humanly possible.

QUESTION: I don't want to know what...

McGOVERN: Let me say how I think it can be done. I think if we made a flat commitment to the government in North Vietnam and to the Viet Cong and made it clear to the regime in Saigon that on such-and-such a date, every last American troop, lock stock and barrel, all the equipment, all the troops, all the airplanes, everything would be out of there—I think within 24 hours the other side would agree to negotiations leading to the release of our prisoners and would give assurances about the safety of our forces during the withdrawal process. Once those two conditions were met, it would seem to me that just as fast as we could deploy our forces and load them on the ships and the airplanes, we ought to bring them out of there. I see no reason why this has to be drawn out. [applause]

[00:45:26]

QUESTION: My real question is, though, that if you were in a position to make that bargain, would you say that that's going to be December 31, 1970, June 1971, or tomorrow?

McGOVERN: Well, I'd try to get it done tomorrow, but I'd do it just as soon as I could get an agreement from the other side to release the prisoners and to agree to the safe extrication of our forces. I think the minute we agree on a definite withdrawal date—whether you're talking about next December or next June—I think the moment we agree to that definite withdrawal date, when all forces are coming out, then you can very quickly begin negotiations on these other questions.

QUESTION: The residents of South Dakota had the opportunity to vote in the general election on the question of lowering the voting age, as the voters in this state did in the latter part of May. I have a two-part question. Do you think it is a federal question or is it a state question? What are your thoughts regarding the lowering of the voting age?

McGOVERN: Well, you know the Congress has already approved the lowering of the voting age in Congressional and federal elections to 18. That's already cleared both the House and the Senate, and has been signed into law by the President. I was one of the co-sponsors of

that measure. With reference to state elections, I think that is a state question, and I would favor the reduction of the voting age in every state for state and local offices, so that it corresponds with the action the Congress has already taken on Congressional and federal elections.

Thank you very much for your attention. [applause]

STRAUB: Thank you very much, Senator. I now want to return the podium to Kay Corbett.

CORBETT: Senator McGovern, the citizens of Oregon and in particular Portland State University is honored to have you here. Thank you for coming. Thank you, Democratic National Committeeman Blaine Whipple; thank you to the Honorable Robert Straub—and before you leave, I think you should meet one more person in this audience who is another very important person in Oregon today. That is Mrs. Robert Straub—Patricia Straub. Will you stand, Pat? [applause] Good evening.

[brief background chatter; program ends at 00:48:24]