

Enactment of New Constitution Bill and Related Legislation. - British Government's Reaffirmation of Sanctions Policy. - Rhodesian Espionage Trials. - Other Developments.

Following the result of the referendum of June 20, 1969, on the Smith regime's proposals for a Republic and a new Constitution [see 23474 A], the Rhodesian Legislative Assembly passed in November 1969 four Bills, including the Constitution Bill proper. Mr. Smith had told the Legislative Assembly on Sept. 3 that there would be no formal declaration of a Republic and that in any case the new status could not come into effect until the electorate had accepted the proposed Constitution at a general election, which would probably be held early in 1970. The regime, he added, had considered proclaiming Nov. 11, the anniversary of U.D.I., as Republic Day, but this had been rejected because that day was already an Independence Day holiday. However, from 1970 Republic Day would be observed as a holiday on the second last Monday in October.

The Constitution Bill, published on Sept. 11, while incorporating the basic White Paper proposals of May 21 [see 23474 A], provided in addition that the Head of State and Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces would be a President appointed by the Cabinet for not more than two five-year terms with limited constitutional powers.

Mr. Lardner-Burke (Minister of Justice and Law and Order), moving the Bill's second reading on Oct. 2, said that Rhodesia had no alternative but to break its ties with Britain and become a Republic. "We cannot as a country," he declared, "recognize a Queen who has, on the advice of the British Government, refused to accept our Constitution and Government." Rhodesian Europeans had been "dismayed and saddened by the reversion to savagery, chaos and violence" in independent African countries, and the 1965 Constitution would have led inevitably to African majority rule with the risk of irresponsible government. Majority rule, as required by the British Government, would result in the removal of all European political influence and a struggle for power between the two largest African tribes, leading eventually to rule by the Mashona and the subjugation of all other races and tribes. "It is foolish," Mr. Lardner-Burke said, "to delude ourselves that Europeans would be allowed to retain their own standards and characteristic way of life, or that peace and civilized government would be maintained. Events to the north prove that this would not happen." The Westminster parliamentary system, the Minister continued, required a homogeneous population with long political experience, which Rhodesia did not possess. Violent racial antagonism could result from racial rivalry being allowed to enter politics, and the likelihood of political competition between races should as far as possible be eliminated. Under the new Constitution, the races would not compete for eventual domination, and the degree of political participation would be controlled by an "unemotional, exact arithmetical calculation leading eventually to equal participation by the Europeans and the Africans, and parity between the Mashona and the Matabele". Each would gain security in the knowledge that its political future was assured and could not be hindered or eroded.

The Bill, which was strongly opposed by the National People's Union (the African Opposition) and by Dr. Ahrn Palley, the Independent M.P. for Highfield, completed its Committee stage on Oct. 29, and on Nov. 17 passed its remaining stages by 47 votes to 13.

Meanwhile, the Government had introduced on Oct. 14 the Land Tenure Bill, the provisions of which had also been foreshadowed in the White Paper of May 21. Under this Bill, designed to replace the existing Land Apportionment Act, all land in Rhodesia would be divided into a European area of 44,952,900 acres, an African area of 44,944,500 acres, and 6,617,500 acres of national land. Although for land tenure purposes the Bill did not differentiate between Europeans, Asians and Coloureds, it provided for legislation on the ownership and occupation of land in European areas "which makes provision for different classes of Europeans".

Mr. Philip van Heerden (Minister of Mines, Lands and Water Development), moving the Bill's second reading on Oct. 15, said that the proposed division of land between Europeans and Africans was fair and just, and would "ease the braking effect of the African Tribal Trust lands on the growth of the economy as a

whole". During 1968 the 44,000,000 acres of African land had produced only £3,500,000 for the economy, compared with nearly £60,000,000 yielded by the 35,000,000 European acres. Revealing that the Government had been under pressure for some time from M.P.s in a number of urban constituencies to introduce legislation banning Asians and Coloureds from acquiring property in White suburbs, Mr. van Heerden announced that proposals would be introduced to deal with this problem.

The Land Tenure Bill was subsequently passed by the Legislative Assembly, and on Nov. 18 the Assembly approved by the necessary two-thirds majority a motion asking Mr. Clifford Dupont, the Officer Administering the Government, to give his assent to the Constitution and Land Tenure Bills, together with two associated measures, the Electoral Bill and the High Court Amendment Bill. The Electoral Bill, which had been introduced in the Legislative Assembly on Oct. 20, provided for the methods of election for members of the new House of Assembly and Senate. All four Bills were signed by Mr. Dupont on Nov. 29. Mr. Smith told a press conference on Dec. 3 that he expected that the next general election would take place in April 1970. Rhodesia was now a *de facto* Republic, although the new Constitution would not come into effect until after the dissolution of the present Parliament. Rejecting the possibility of further negotiations with Britain before then, Mr. Smith declared: "The Constitution is now a *fait accompli* and any change in it in the future lies with the Rhodesian Parliament."

This Order, providing for the continuance in force of that Section of the 1965 Act which enabled the Queen in Council to take any action concerning events in Rhodesia, was approved by the U.K. House of Commons on Oct. 16, 1969, by 222 votes to 26.

Mr. Stewart (Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary), moving approval of the Order, said that failure to keep the Section in force would be a denial of the Queen's sovereignty over Rhodesia. Since the House had last debated Rhodesian affairs in October 1968 [see 23121 A], the real nature of Mr. Smith's philosophy and policy had been made plain and it had also been made clear to everyone that the British Government, while standing by the six principles, was ready, provided those principles could be secured, to be flexible and reasonable on anything consistent with them.

The new Rhodesian Constitution, Mr. Stewart continued, could only be justified if the Smith regime made it overwhelmingly clear that it was giving the less privileged community every possible opportunity to improve its education and to become more prosperous. However, at present ten times as much was spent on the education of a European child as on that of an African and, while about 11 per cent of European children moved from primary to secondary schools, only one per cent of Africans did so. As for the ownership of land, the 230,000 Europeans would own rather more than the 4,800,000 Africans. Furthermore, if the African happened to advance to the position where he might increase his wealth and voting rights in a town, the redefinition of areas was such as to operate solidly to the disadvantage of an African who sought to be either a shopkeeper or a professional man. It was impossible to escape the conclusion that by this Constitution the regime was making it clear that it rejected majority rule, not merely now but permanently, and that there was no way, short of a complete change of heart and mind, of reconciling its attitude with the six principles.

Mr. Stewart listed three possible bases on which negotiations might be reopened with the regime, viz. (1) through a complete change of heart and mind in Salisbury, involving the overthrow of everything represented by and embodied in the new Constitution; (2) on the basis of "saying that this country still stands by the six principles, but we are entering negotiations because we believe that the things which divide us from Salisbury are not matters of principle but merely procedural difficulties which the greater wisdom of some people may be able to iron out." However, Mr. Stewart commented, it would be difficult for anyone who had followed the most recent negotiations to argue that what divided the two sides were mere procedural differences; (3) through the abandonment by Britain of the six principles. "I very much hope," he went on, "that what we have heard about proposals to reopen negotiations does not mean that. Unless there is a clear and unmistakable indication of a change of heart and mind in Salisbury, to talk about reopening negotiations will have the practical effect of encouraging the Smith regime to believe that what this country has in mind is the abandonment of the six principles."

The British Government had held and would continue to hold the view that the most rigorous application of sanctions should be maintained, and would use its best endeavours throughout the world to see that other nations did the same. Although Mr. Smith had believed that there would be an expanding and vigorous economy, no country had recognized the illegal regime, investments were "dwindling to a dribble", export earnings had shrunk by 40 per cent, and, alone among all the countries of the world, the total national product was less than it was four years ago. Mr. Smith's "disastrous policies" had led both the European

and African populations of Rhodesia down a path which became increasingly narrower as the years went by.

As long as Rhodesia was ruled by a racist minority, said Mr. Stewart, Britain and mankind must stand against that minority. Already in some parts of Africa there were forms of government which asserted that because a man had a black skin his political rights should be diminished. It was of enormous importance to the world that that principle should not be extended.

Sir Alec Douglas-Home (C.) said it was not disputed that if Mr. Smith's proposed Constitution was adopted Britain could not be a partner to it. There would have to be a change of attitude in Salisbury and, although he could not say whether that was possible, likely, or very unlikely, there was no need to suggest that Britain would have to "wriggle" to get a settlement. Mr. Stewart had given himself a much more uphill task when he had tried to justify the policy of mandatory sanctions. It was predictable, indeed certain, that with South Africa exempt from the sanctions net they could not achieve the political result required by the Prime Minister. When the Government had handed over responsibility to the United Nations it had lost control of the situation, and now Mr. Stewart had nothing to suggest except a stiffened sanctions policy. The question for the Opposition, Sir Alec continued, was whether to vote against the Order or, as it had done in the past, to abstain. Although one of the factors influencing him was that the new Constitution had not yet been passed by the Rhodesian Parliament, what weighed with him most was the way in which a vote might be interpreted in Rhodesia. While in the House a vote might be a protest against policies which were rapidly becoming incredible, in Rhodesia it would be seen as giving the green light to Mr. Smith to go ahead with the declaration of a Republic and the adoption of his Constitution, which included separate development. If the Rhodesian electors wanted that, "let them say it for themselves without a green light from the House".

Advising the Opposition to abstain, Sir Alec said that complete freedom would be necessary whatever Government was in power in Britain after the next election. The next Government would have to review the policy towards Rhodesia in all its dimensions, and there should be no previous commitment to fetter its freedom to look at the problem afresh.

Mr. Judd (Lab.) said it was wrong to argue that the sanctions policy had failed. What had failed was action by all countries to apply sanctions effectively.

Mr. Sandys (C.) declared that, while he fully agreed that the House could not in any circumstances approve the new Rhodesian Constitution, condemnation of it did not of itself justify the indefinite continuance of sanctions. The fact that Rhodesia was travelling fast along the road to *apartheid* was in no small measure due to the Government's gross mishandling of the situation. In successive negotiations with Mr. Smith the Prime Minister had offered too little too late. If the Conservative Government had remained in office, there would have been no U.D.I. and Rhodesia would have achieved legal independence on terms no less honourable than those offered too late to Mr. Smith by the Labour Government.

Mr. Enoch Powell (C.) said that the House was debating a proposal to renew the operative part of an Act which began with the statement that the British Government had "jurisdiction in and over Southern Rhodesia and responsibility for Southern Rhodesia". There could never have been any other statute so unrelated to the facts of the real world. Although he could not vote for any legislation legalizing a Constitution for Rhodesia under which there would not be evident and relatively early advance towards majority rule, he did not believe that there was a possibility of agreement upon such a Constitution between any British Government and any foreseeable future Government in Rhodesia. If it was true that a mandate of the U.N. bound Britain to maintain on its statute book "an evident absurdity" and obliged the country to engage in actions which were "futile and damaging", then responsible government was lost. To maintain any longer a legal and practical farce was neither to the credit of the House nor to the welfare of Britain, could not do a particle of good to anyone one and was nothing but self-deception.

Mr. Foot (Lab.) said that the result of Mr. Powell's policy would help to fortify the forces of White supremacy in Africa. If the Opposition Front Bench followed such a policy, that was how it would be interpreted.

At the conclusion of the debate a group of Conservative back-benchers, supported by Mr. Desmond Donnelly (Independent), forced a division but were defeated by 222 votes to 26, the majority of Conservative members abstaining. Three Liberals, including Mr. Jeremy Thorpe, voted with the Government.

The House of Lords approved the Order without a division on Oct. 21.

The Commonwealth Sanctions Committee announced, after a meeting in London on Sept. 24, 1969, that it had considered the report of the seven-nation working party set up on June 28, 1969, to review the

effectiveness of existing sanctions [see page 23428]. It had noted that, in addition to its trade with South Africa and Portugal, Rhodesia still maintained commercial relations with a number of countries whose governments had declared their intention to apply sanctions, but there were encouraging signs that this trade was being reduced. The Committee had agreed to submit for the approval of Commonwealth Governments a “number of recommendations on practical steps which might be taken to improve the vigilance against sanction breakers”, and had considered the possibility of “additional measures”. [For the U.N. General Assembly's resolution on Rhodesia of Nov. 21, 1969, see page 28777.]

Mr. Dick Taverne (Financial Secretary to the Treasury) told the House of Commons on Jan. 20, 1970, that the cost of sanctions to the Exchequer in 1969 had been a little less than £4,000,000 and, if the Rhodesian situation remained unchanged, was expected to continue at about that level in 1970. Although the cost to the U.K. balance of payments could not be precisely estimated, it was probably slightly less in 1969 than the estimated figure of about £40,000,000 in each of the preceding three years, and a further reduction was expected in 1970.

Mr. Foley (Parliamentary Under-secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs) announced on Dec. 19, 1969, that the Government had decided, subject to Parliamentary approval, that a suitable grant should be made as an “expression of gratitude” to Sir Humphrey Gibbs, the former governor of Rhodesia, for his “outstanding record of service to the Crown” in that country. Sir Humphrey, Mr. Foley said, had asked that the award should take the form of provision in favour of Lady Gibbs and their children rather than of a personal grant to himself, and the government therefore proposed that a total sum of £66,000 should be allocated both for this purpose and for grants in appreciation of the service rendered to Sir Humphrey by former members of his household.

A Foreign and Commonwealth Office spokesman stated on Dec. 19 that part of the grant, the amount of which had been settled in consultation with Sir Humphrey, would be paid to Sir John Pestell, former Comptroller of Government House in Salisbury, and to Captain Christopher Owen and Mrs. Isabella Marjorie Baxter, respectively Sir Humphrey's former A.D.C. and confidential secretary.

It had been announced from 10 Downing Street on Aug. 22, 1969, that the Queen had appointed Lady Gibbs to be a Dame Commander of the Order of the British Empire (D.B.E.) in recognition of her services in Rhodesia.

During December 1969 Mr. John Roger Nicholson (38), financial editor of the *Rhodesia Herald* and part-time correspondent of *The Times*, and Mr. Alfred Trevor Gallaher (53), a lawyer and prominent member of the ruling Rhodesian Front party, were sentenced by the High Court in Salisbury to 18 months' and four years' imprisonment respectively on charges of having transmitted economic information about Rhodesia to an agent of an unnamed foreign country.

Mr. Nicholson, having been detained on Oct. 29 under the Emergency Powers (Maintenance of Law and Order) Regulations, was sent for trial on Nov. 12 on a charge under the Official Secrets (Southern Rhodesia) Act, 1914, carrying a maximum penalty of five years' imprisonment, and an alternative charge under two sections of the Emergency Powers (Counter-Espionage) Regulations which had been promulgated by the Smith regime on Aug. 15, 1969.

These sections, carrying a maximum penalty of two years' imprisonment or a fine of £1,000, or both, stated that it was an offence: (1) “to divulge, cause or permit to divulge in any manner any information, or engage in any activity likely to further the implementation by any Government, organization or person of a sanctions law or sanctions resolution”; (2) “to obtain, attempt to obtain or assist another person to obtain information which shows the manner in which any sanctions law or sanctions resolution is being circumvented.”

At a further preliminary hearing on Nov. 24 Mr. Nicholson was specially indicted for trial by order of the Rhodesian Attorney General on three further charges, one under the Official Secrets Act and two under the Counter-Espionage Regulations.

At his trial on Dec. 9 before Mr. Justice Harry E. Davies and two assessors Mr. Nicholson pleaded “guilty” to one charge each under the Official Secrets Act and the Counter-Espionage Regulations, his pleas of “not guilty” to the remaining charges being accepted by the prosecution. Although most of the trial was heard in secret, part of a statement of facts agreed between the prosecution and defence was presented to the Court by Mr. Brendan Treacey, Director of Public Prosecutions.

Mr Treacey, dealing with the first charge, said that at about 8 p.m. on Sept. 21 an African police reservist had seen Mr. Nicholson drive up to a Salisbury suburban post office, unlock a private post box and place a white envelope inside, re-lock the box and drive off. On Sept. 22 a detective inspector had opened the

envelope and, having photographed its contents, re-sealed it and replaced it in the box. Later the same day an African detective sergeant saw a "foreign agent" remove the envelope from the box.

When Mr. Nicholson was arrested in his office on Oct. 29 the police found in his possession a key to the private post office box, and in his desk a carbon copy of a six-typed report which formed the basis of the second charge. Later the same day the police searched Mr. Nicholson's home and discovered three typed copies of what appeared to be instructions for reports on internal, external and economic affairs. These instructions, which had been typed on a typewriter to which the "foreign agent" had access, contained reference to copies of bills of lading and other unclassified documentation which would show that Rhodesian products were being exported to countries supposedly implementing U.N. mandatory sanctions. Such information, Mr. Treacey added, was for the use of the U.N. special committee on sanctions.

On Dec. 10 Mr. Justice Davies sentenced Mr. Nicholson to nine months' imprisonment with hard labour on each charge.

The judge said that Mr. Nicholson's conduct had affected the welfare of every one in the country and must be abhorrent to the community as a whole. In deciding the punishment, the necessity for some sort of deterrent could not be lost sight of. During his summing-up the judge read out the following unsworn statement which Mr. Nicholson had made at the previous day's secret hearing:

"I have always been convinced that Rhodesia needs recognition and an open trading relationship at least with most of the developed nations, if this country is to make the most of its potential for long-term political stability and economic growth. As a journalist and citizen with identified political views I have done what I could to help bring this situation about in the past four years.... My acknowledged contact with a representative of a foreign Government was... part of the same pattern of activity. I believed it would be useful overall if a sound appreciation of the situation was received by the Government in question, as a corrective to the views held in other quarters. In the nature of my journalistic work there was always a risk that I would collect or obtain information which could be deemed to be useful to an enemy. But I never sought such information, and I do not believe that my activity endangered the security of Rhodesia.... My employers had no knowledge of these extra-mural activities and were in no way party to them."

The judge, continuing his summing-up, said that among documents found in Mr. Nicholson's office was a statement of his own assets and liabilities, including about £9,000 in a bank in the foreign country concerned in the case. Although this was suspicious, there was no proof that the money had been paid for information received and no such inference could be drawn. The agent to whom Mr. Nicholson had given the information worked for the Government of a "Western nation" which was not at war with Rhodesia, but in the context of sanctions this nation was an adversary of Rhodesia and thus constituted an enemy within the meaning of the Official Secrets Act.

Mr. Gallaher, who had been committed for trial on Nov. 12 on two charges under the Official Secrets Act and five alternative ones in respect of the Counter-Espionage Regulations, pleaded "guilty" before Mr. Justice Davies on Dec. 17 to four charges, two under each measure. His pleas of "not guilty" to the three remaining charges were accepted by the prosecution. As in the case of Mr. Nicholson, most of the trial took place in secret.

Mr. Treacey, outlining the case, said that Mr. Gallaher had left the following documents in a private box at a Salisbury post office: (1) a sealed envelope, the contents of which were photographed by the police and found to contain a report of a visit paid by the defendant to Johannesburg in August 1969; the envelope was later collected from the box by a foreign agent; (2) a paper, headed "for information of Rhodesian Front Headquarters", indicating how sanctions were being circumvented; this had been dictated by Mr. Gallaher to his secretary, but was not received by the party; (3) an envelope containing a report on a confidential lunch with Mr. Rodney Simmons, administrative secretary of the Rhodesian Front, and entertainment expenses of £42 for the month of August; (4) a letter, addressed to "Trevor", giving details of negotiations for the sale and export of Rhodesian tobacco.

Personal contacts between Mr. Gallaher and the agent had included the passing of a report of a Rhodesian Front meeting and £36 for entertainment expenses incurred during September. After Mr. Gallaher's arrest, police searching his home had found equipment for "invisible" writing which would not be detectable by such normal methods as ultra-violet rays and iodine fuming, and a list of instructions to report on Rhodesian internal, foreign and economic affairs.

In a statement to the officer who arrested him, Mr. Gallaher was alleged to have said: "During the last few months in particular Britain's continued efforts to enforce sanctions have indeed become farcical and she continues to be supported or perhaps coerced by the Communist members of the U.N. to the extent that we must accept the nauseating fact that Britain has turned to Communism. Her withdrawal from the Far East

and the Indian Ocean with Russia's control of the Red Sea and the Mediterranean presents an ominous concept.... The other major Western Powers have in the past been deceived and cheated by Britain, in that they have realized that in imposing sanctions through the U.N. she has endeavoured to destroy Rhodesia as an additional move to enable Communism to penetrate southern Africa so that the Cape sea route could then be destroyed."

Mr. Justice Davies on Dec. 18 sentenced Mr. Gallaher to a total of six years' imprisonment with hard labour, two years of which would run concurrently with the other four. Passing sentence, the judge said that he was reducing the term of imprisonment by one year because Mr. Gallaher had been kept in solitary confinement for one month after his arrest.

In this connexion the judge read to the Court part of an unsworn statement by Mr. Gallaher on the previous day, in which he had said that he had been detained by the police on Oct. 10, removed to Goromonzi, about 30 miles from Salisbury, and been kept in a cell measuring 9 ft. by 11 ft. "Although," Mr. Gallaher continued, "there was an inspection panel in the door and a skylight, both were kept firmly closed so that no natural light could enter. An electric bulb was kept on constantly and it was impossible to distinguish day from night. I was refused any reading matter of any sort and allowed no communication with my legal representative, despite requests repeatedly made, or with anyone else. Periods of exercise were 10 minutes twice a day at first and then reduced to once a day, and shaving facilities were also withdrawn for periods. For some time meals were served cut up and a teaspoon provided." Mr. Gallaher said that he was permitted to see his lawyer for the first time on Oct. 31 and his wife on Nov. 7, and was not allowed a radio set and reading matter until Nov. 8.

While not wishing to comment on the rights and wrongs of Mr. Gallaher's detention, the Judge said, he had no doubt that it had constituted a very severe punishment. When solitary confinement was ordered by a court the maximum customary period was two weeks. As regards the charges against Mr. Gallaher, he had claimed that his actions were in Rhodesia's interests, but the evidence showed that the information passed on to an unnamed foreign Power could have helped to thwart the country's attempts to circumvent sanctions. Mr. Gallaher had abused his standing as a lawyer by passing on information given to him in his professional capacity, and by masquerading as a strong supporter of the Rhodesian Front had obtained information from senior party members and Government Ministers. The fact that secret writing materials had been found at his home was "hardly consistent with honest motives".

Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Gallaher were released from prison and deported from Rhodesia on Jan. 15, 1970. A statement from the Prime Minister's Office on the following day announced that both men, having surrendered their Rhodesian citizenship, had been declared prohibited immigrants and escorted to an aircraft bound for London. "The decision to make this deal," the statement continued, "was taken in the national interest after the most careful examination of all the circumstances. The Government wishes to assure Rhodesians of their conviction that this move, which is in keeping with international practice, will confer advantages on Rhodesia which will outweigh all other considerations."

The Johannesburg *Sunday Times* had alleged on Jan. 4 that Mr. Nicholson had been recruited by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency in 1968 and had passed his information to Mr. Irl Smith, Political Counsellor at the U.S. Consulate-General in Salisbury. The paper also alleged that Mr. Gallaher had passed economic information on behalf of the State Department to Mr. Paul O'Neill, the U.S. Consul-General. Both Mr. Irl Smith and Mr. O'Neill immediately denied the allegations.

Mr. Percy Mkudu was on Aug. 27, 1969, deposed as leader of the National People's Union in the Legislative Assembly and succeeded by Mr. Chad Chipunza, a former leader from March to September 1966 of the then Opposition United People's Party. Mr. Mkudu, having at first agreed to serve under Mr. Chipunza as deputy leader of the National People's Union, changed his mind on Aug. 28 and resigned from the party, saying that it would be a betrayal of all his "moral and political" principles to serve under Mr. Chipunza.

A renewal of infiltration into Rhodesia by African nationalist guerrillas was reported during January 1970. The headquarters of the security forces announced on Jan. 5, 1970, that efforts were being made to track down a group of guerrillas who were believed to have crossed the Zambezi river into Rhodesia from Zambia on Jan. 3. On that day, the communique continued, about 20 men from the Zambian bank of the river had fired on a clearly marked police patrol boat, holing it in three places and slightly wounding a White officer.

A further communiqué on Jan. 17 stated that during a guerrilla raid on the Victoria Falls airport and a detachment of South African police the previous night one infiltrator had been killed and four South

African policemen wounded. The headquarters in Lusaka of the Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) claimed on Jan. 18 that in the raid its forces had killed eight South Africans and five Rhodesian soldiers. The Rhodesian Executive Council had announced on Aug. 19, 1969, that death sentences on 19 African prisoners had been commuted to life imprisonment. Mr. Lardner-Burke had told the Legislative Assembly on June 27 that 44 persons were at that time under sentence of death, having exhausted their remedies in the courts.—(Times - Daily Telegraph - Guardian - Financial Times - Cape Times - Hansard - Survey of British and Commonwealth Affairs) (Prev. rep. 23474 A.)

© 1931- 2011 Keesing's Worldwide, LLC - All Rights Reserved.