

U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 118—PART 23

SEPTEMBER 7, 1972 TO SEPTEMBER 15, 1972

(PAGES 29651 TO 30948)

tant, he became an Anglican Rector in Somersetshire, then left his living in 1634 to enter the Catholic Church. After his conversion he renewed his acquaintance with Calvert. Calvert sent Lewgar to Maryland with a commission for a new provincial government (April 15, 1637).

Lewgar arrived November 28, 1637 with his wife Ann, and a nine-year-old son, John. Ann Lewgar died several years after her arrival. Lewgar lived on St. John's until 1647 or 1648, when he returned to England. Lewgar sought entrance into the Jesuits in 1647, but was refused. He became chaplain in Lord Baltimore's house on Wilde-Street, near London, where he died of plague in 1665. He left no will in Maryland, but was survived at least by his son John, who had remained in Maryland after his father's departure.

Lewgar did not share in the original trading monopoly with the Lord Proprietor, Thomas Cornwaleys, and other wealthy adventurers. As Collector and Receiver of the Rents and Revenues, and often as the Proprietor's legal representative, Lewgar handled proprietary financial affairs in the Province. He operated a plantation on St. John's tract. He kept some of the Proprietor's livestock at St. John's and owned hogs and cattle himself. He also kept various tools and goods at St. John's for the Proprietor's use and carried out business deals on the Proprietor's behalf. Lewgar participated in smaller kinds of trade, as with skins, and he owned a ketch which he hired out at a per diem rate. Many settlers were indebted to him.

In 1638 Governor Leonard Calvert wrote of John Lewgar to his brother Cecil, that he was a "very serviceable and diligent man in his secretaries place," and "a faithful and able assistant" to Leonard Calvert. This seems to be an accurate description of Lewgar; as a Provincial official he seems to have been loyal and dutiful to the Proprietor, as well as fair in his activities. In a letter to Calvert (January 5, 1638/9), he stated that he did not understand the dissension and disfavor among governing officials and settlers. In a case involving one angry Catholic and several angry Protestants, he appears to have been particularly level-headed and objective in his decision. His turn to England and the priesthood indicates, perhaps, a weariness of politics and dissension in the Province.

SIMON OVERZEE

Simon Overzee, successful merchant and planter, was born in England about 1628. He was active in Virginia before transporting his wife and son to Maryland in 1650. He moved back and forth from Virginia to Maryland in the 1650's. From at least 1656, he lived in St. John's and may have extended the House there.

His first wife, Sarah, was the daughter of Sarah and Adam Thoroughgood of Lynnhaven, Virginia. Sarah died at St. John's in childbirth. Mary Clocker, midwife, was nursing the newborn child after Sarah's death, according to testimony given on November 1, 1658. Mary Glocker was giving testimony since she, Thomas Courtney (her stepson), and Mary and John Williams were being tried for theft of goods valued at £50 sterling. The goods, including gold and silver laces and other finery, were stolen from chests and trunks at St. John's. Depositions of November 1, 1658 suggest that Mary Glocker nourished malice in her feelings towards Overzee. Mary Williams tells that when she commented to Mary Glocker:

"That these things could not be used here but they would of known, and that Clocker answered hang him (as she conceives Mr. Overzee) rather than ever he shall have them, I will burne them, and further sayd shee would bury them in a case in the Ground."

All the defendants plead not guilty. The verdict found the Williamses guilty as principals and Mary Clocker and her stepson guilty as accessories.

By February 1659 Overzee had remarried. His second wife, Elizabeth Willoughby, outlived Overzee, who died intestate in March 1660. He left no living heirs to claim his 1950 acres.

It has been suggested that Simon Overzee was ruthless, callous, and shrewd.

WOMEN'S LIBERATION AT ST. JOHN'S

On January 17, 1648 the assembly met at St. John's. At this session Mistress Margaret Brent, the administratrix of Leonard Calvert's estate, applied to the assembly demanding, "to have vote; and voyce also in the howse for her selfe." She called attention to the fact that as she was already "looked upon and received as his Lordship's (Lord Baltimore's) attorney," it seemed only fair that she should have some say in matters concerning the government of the colony. This was refused peremptorily by Governor Greene, and the lady "protested in form against all proceedings of that assembly, unless she might be present and vote as aforesaid."

ELIMINATION OF LOCAL ELECTIONS THROUGHOUT SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, with the decision of the Saigon government last month to eliminate local elections throughout South Vietnam, the curtain fell on another act in the unending tragedy that is Vietnam.

This was a minor act, to be sure. It gave us the drama of democracy created in Vietnam but cast in our own image: A democracy of free elections, separation of legislative and executive functions, an independent judiciary, individual rights, and a free press. In the enthusiasm and innocence of an earlier era, the American people were told, and to a great and understandable degree believed, that the imposition of American democracy on an Indochinese society was at hand.

In the past several years, however, the course of the drama has changed. We have been witnesses to innumerable arbitrary arrests, the suppression of free speech, countless instances of judicial and legislative irregularities. But the facade of democracy has been played out, much like a sideshow at the circus, while the principal action—the murder, destruction, and mutilation caused by the war—has occupied the center stage.

Almost as an after-thought, President Thieu has now rung down the final curtain on the tragi-comedy of democracy in South Vietnam. His little publicized decree led to trenchant and moving editorial comment recently in the Minneapolis Tribune and the New York Times.

These editorials are fitting epitaph to the betrayal of our most basic principles, aspirations, hopes, and dreams in Vietnam. They deserve to be read thoughtfully by all Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAMIZING DEMOCRACY

The abolition of popular elections in South Vietnam's 10,775 hamlets by the stroke of an executive order from Saigon once again underscores the futility of the war and the fatuousness—in today's context—of professed American war aims. The blood of hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese and American soldiers and the suffering of millions of

civilians has been rationalized by lofty commitments to assure for the South Vietnamese people the right to democratic self-government. In explaining his war policy, President Nixon has insisted that when the United States leaves Vietnam, it must be "in a way that gives the South Vietnamese a reasonable chance to survive as a free people."

The immediate result of the new decree is that President Thieu will determine who is to be in charge of local government, from province chiefs to the officials of the smallest village. The extraordinary lesson in democracy thus continues. President Thieu, having demonstrated that it takes only one candidate to stage a democratic election, has more recently indicated through stringent rules controlling the press that in his version of democracy the right to know is as unnecessary as free political choice—in Saigon no less than in Hanoi.

If the experiment in popular government without the ballot works out to Mr. Thieu's satisfaction in the local communities, he will undoubtedly "recommend" it for the national level as well, further emulating the democracy to the North. The fact that the abolition of local elections in the South is to be accomplished within two months indicates that Vietnamization is working more smoothly in politics than in defense.

NO MORE "RICE-ROOTS DEMOCRACY"

In January 1968, the U.S. Department of State used the term "rice-roots democracy" processes in South Vietnam. The American people had been told that we were engaged in a great nation-building effort in Vietnam, a nation in which democratic processes would have a vital place—a nation modeled after our own, with free elections, an independent judiciary, a free press and separate legislative and executive branches. Developments in recent years under President Thieu made a sham of most of this effort, so it is not surprising that when the Thieu government last month abolished local elections it did so without publicity.

Ambassador Bunker in Saigon has cited self-determination for the South Vietnamese people and the development of democratic institutions as two of the most important U.S. objectives in Vietnam. These were an important rationale for our presence in Vietnam during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, and President Nixon has emphasized the importance of self-determination.

Today "rice-roots democracy" is no more in Vietnam, though probably many Americans have forgotten how this rationale was once to justify the American war effort. Or another rationale of halting the expansion of Communist China—a rationale that somehow disappeared, in good measure, when President Nixon took his historic steps toward improved China-America relations.

A Minneapolis journalist recalled the other day that he had first visited Vietnam in 1963, and he reflected on how much time has passed since then, with the end of the war still not in sight. In this context, Scott Long's cartoon today also is pertinent. America has been in the valley of Vietnam death so long that many of us have forgotten what some of the mountains looked like—those mountains to stop Peking, those mountains on which to build a new democracy. And many of us, without the large weekly death lists of young Americans, have forgotten—or at least have tried to forget—the valley of death in which we stand. The valley is still there.

A TRIBUTE TO GORDON F. HARRISON

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on June 30 of this year, Gordon F. Harrison retired from his position as staff director