



UPI Photo

Numerous events in recent years have underscored the need for new international arrangements to safeguard diplomats. In August 1974, U.S. Ambassador Rodger B. Davies was slain by Greek Cypriot gunmen when they invaded the American Embassy in Nicosia. Pictured above the Ambassador is seen being carried from the Embassy after the incident. Following the stretcher bearer on the right is Greek Cypriot Leader Glafkos Clerides, who during the absence of Archbishop Makarios from the island acted as President.

that some of the infractions covered in the convention are not at present crimes or infractions under the Canadian Criminal Code. So any bill that will soon be introduced in the House of Commons will probably have to involve the creation of new crimes in Canada embracing the ideas, first, of threatening to commit a murder, kidnapping or violent attack against an internationally-protected person and, secondly, of committing an attack upon the official premises of an internationally-protected person likely to endanger his life or liberty.

Persons covered

The Legal Committee also had to choose between an all-embracing general phrase and a listing of the persons to be covered. The former solution was adopted. Article 1(1)(b) essentially defines an "internationally-protected person" as an official who, at the time when and in the place where a crime against him is committed, is entitled pursuant to international law to special protection from any attack on his person, freedom or dignity. The main reason for this is that it was impossible to draw up a complete list of all conventions, present and future, regional or universal, under which individuals might be granted personal inviolability or special protection.

Having agreed on which persons and what crimes should be covered and having

decided to borrow the extradition-or-prosecution procedures from the hijacking conventions, the Legal Committee was still faced with a Latin American amendment on asylum and an Arab-African one on self-determination.

Asylum

The Latin American amendment was the object of corridor negotiations for more than a month. As first introduced by a group of 11 Latin American countries, led by Mexico, the amendment read: "None of the provisions of this convention shall be construed as modifying the Treaties on Asylum". From the beginning, the Canadian delegation strongly opposed this amendment on the grounds that it would have created a loophole of such magnitude as to nullify the purpose of the convention.

The Latin Americans wished, in essence, to safeguard an institution, peculiar to their continent, that had saved so many human lives. It was, for them, a matter of principle. Their purpose was not to create an escape clause, yet they recognized that to a great extent their amendment would have had such an effect.

While the Canadian delegation was of the opinion that we were better off with no convention at all than with a convention containing a loophole of such magnitude as almost to nullify it, other Western delegations, such as the British and Amer-

Latin Americans saw asylum as matter of principle