

post, to make such an offer. There is no right of the individual to be granted asylum or temporary refuge. Because of the ill-defined nature of this exception to the general rule, it has in practice tended to be closely circumscribed.

In the case of the 55 persons granted temporary safe haven in the Canadian Embassy in Santiago, it was the forbearance of the Chilean authorities, for whatever reason, and the subsequent granting of safe-conducts, which brought about a successful outcome. It was because our Embassy had lines of communication with the new Chilean authorities that the necessary arrangements for the departure of these persons were possible.

I might conclude my brief survey of these complex and difficult questions with the following thoughts: The exposure to Canadian public opinion of representatives of a country practicing policies against human dignity and freedom of conscience can, over a period of time, have an important effect on those policies. If these foreign missions were closed, then this important channel of opinion would be closed. This process may be a slow one, but then much change, involving the evolution of ideas, is slow. The saying goes that Rome was not built in a day. Nor was democracy in a country ever destroyed in a day. The spark remains, perhaps not always readily visible, but it is not extinguished. I believe that exposure to ideas is the surest way to bring about a change in attitudes.

Contacts between nations serve more purposes than the rupture of these contacts. Our influence is greater on others not in a void but where a dialogue exists.

S/C