Non-Corrigé
Uncorrected

CR 98/7

International Court
of Justice

THE HAGUE

Cour internationale
de Justice

LA HAYE

YEAR 1998

Public sitting

held on Tuesday 7 April 1998, at 10 a.m., at the Peace Palace,

Vice-President Weeramantry, Acting President, presiding

in the case concerning the Application of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations

(Paraguay v. *United States of America)*

Request for the Indication of Provisional Measures

VERBATIM RECORD

ANNEE 1998

Audience publique

tenue le mardi 7 avril 1998, à 10 heures, au Palais de la Paix,

sous la présidence de M. Weeramantry, vice-président, faisant fonction de président

en l'affaire de l'Application de la convention de Vienne sur les relations consulaires

(Paraguay c. Etats-Unis d'Amerique)

Demande en indication de mesures conservatoires

COMPTE RENDU

Present:	Vice-President	Weeramantry, Acting President
	President	Schwebel
	Judges	Oda
		Bedjaoui
		Guillaume
		Ranjeva
		Herczegh
		Shi
		Fleischhauer
		Koroma
		Vereshchetin
		Higgins
		Parra-Aranguren
		Kooijmans
		Rezek
	Registrar	Valencia-Ospina

Présents : M. Weeramantry, vice-président, faisant fonction de président en l'affaire
M. Schwebel, président
MM. Oda
Bedjaoui
Guillaume
Ranjeva
Herczegh
Shi
Fleischhauer
Koroma
Vereshchetin
Mme Higgins,
MM. Parra-Aranguren,
Kooijmans
Rezek, juges

M. Valencia-Ospina, greffier

The Government of the Republic of Paraguay is represented by:

H. E. Mr. Manuel María Cáceres, Ambassador of the Republic of Paraguay to the Kingdom of Belgium and the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Brussels,

as Agent;

Mr. Donald Francis Donovan, Debevoise & Plimpton, New York,

Mr. Barton Legum, Debevoise & Plimpton, New York,

Mr. Don Malone, Debevoise & Plimpton, New York,

Mr. José Emilio Gorostiaga, Professor of Law at the University of Paraguay in Asunción and Legal Counsel to the Office of the President of Paraguay,

as Counsel and Advocates.

The Government of the United States of America is represented by:

Mr. David R. Andrews, Legal Adviser, United States Department of State,

as Agent;

Mr. Michael J. Matheson, Deputy Legal Adviser, United States Department of State,

as Co-Agent;

Mr. John R. Crook, Assistant Legal Adviser for United Nations Affairs, United States Department of State

Ms Catherine Brown, Assistant Legal Adviser for Consular Affairs, United States Department of State

as Counsel and Advocates;

Mr. Sean D. Murphy, Legal Counsellor, United States Embassy, The Hague,

Mr. Robert J. Ericson, United States Department of Justice,

as Counsel.

Le Gouvernement de la République du Paraguay est représenté par:

S. Exc. M. Manuel María Cáceres, ambassadeur du Paraguay au Royaume de Belgique et au Royaume des Pays-Bas, à Bruxelles,

comme agent;

M. Donald Francis Donovan, membre du cabinet Debevoise et Plimpton, New York,

M. Barton Legum, membre du cabinet Debevoise et Plimpton, New York,

M. Don Malone, membre du cabinet Debevoise et Plimpton, New York,

M. José Emilio Gorostiaga, professeur de droit à l'Université du Paraguay à Asunción et conseiller juridique de la Présidence du Paraguay,

comme conseils et avocats.

Le Gouvernement des Etats-Unis d'Amérique est représenté par:

M. David R. Andrews, conseiller juridique du département d'Etat des Etats-Unis,

comme agent;

M. Michael J. Matheson, conseiller juridique adjoint principal du département d'Etat des Etats-Unis,

comme coagent;

M. John R. Crook, conseiller juridique adjoint chargé des questions concernant les Nations Unies au département d'Etat des Etats-Unis,

Mme Catherine Brown, conseiller juridique adjoint chargé des affaires consulaires au département d'Etat des Etats-Unis,

comme conseils et avocats;

M. Sean D. Murphy, conseiller juridique à l'ambassade des Etats-Unis, La Haye,

M. Robert J. Ericson, du département de la justice des Etats-Unis,

comme conseils.

The VICE-PRESIDENT, Acting President: Please be seated. The sitting is open. The Court meets today, pursuant to Article 74, paragraph 3, of the Rules of Court, to hear the observations of the Parties on the request for the indication of provisional measures submitted by the Republic of Paraguay in the case concerning the *Application of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations* (*Paraguay* v. *United States of America*).

Article 32, paragraph 1, of the Rules of Court provides that, if the President of the Court is a national of one of the parties to a case, he shall not exercise the functions of the presidency in respect of that case. The President of the Court, Judge Schwebel, will therefore not be exercising the functions of the presidency in this case and it falls to me, in my capacity as Vice-President of the Court, to do so, in accordance with Article 13 of the Rules of Court.

The proceedings were instituted on 3 April 1998 by the filing in the Registry of the Court of an application by the Government of the Republic of Paraguay against the United States of America. In that Application, the Government of Paraguay refers, as a basis for the Court's jurisdiction, to Article I of the Optional Protocol Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 24 April 1963.

Paraguay claims that the United States has acted in violation of obligations owed to Paraguay under Article 36, subparagraph 1 *(b)*, of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations. It contends that,

> "In 1992, the authorities of the Commonwealth of Virginia, one of the federated states comprising the United States, detained a Paraguayan citizen named Angel Francisco Breard. Without advising Mr. Breard of his right to consular assistance, or notifying Paraguayan consular officers of his detention, as required by the Vienna Convention, such authorities tried and convicted Mr. Breard and sentenced him to death"

and asks the Court for *restitutio in integrum,* or

> "the re-establishment of the situation that existed before the United States failed to provide the notifications and permit the consular assistance required by the Convention".

I will now ask the Registrar to read out the decision requested of the Court, as formulated in paragraph 25 of the Application of Paraguay:

The REGISTRAR:

"The Republic of Paraguay asks the Court to adjudge and declare:

(1) that the United States, in arresting, trying, convicting and sentencing Angel Francisco Breard, as described in the preceding statement of facts, violated its international legal obligations to Paraguay, in its own right and in the exercise of its right of diplomatic protection of its national, as provided by Articles 5 and 36 of the Vienna Convention;

(2) that Paraguay is therefore entitled to *restitutio in integrum*;

(3) that the United States is under an international legal obligation not to apply the doctrine of 'procedural default', or any other doctrine of its internal law, so as to preclude the exercise of the rights accorded under Article 36 of the Vienna Convention; and

(4) that the United States is under an international legal obligation to carry out in conformity with the foregoing international legal obligations any future detention of or criminal proceedings against Angel Francisco Breard or any other Paraguayan national in its territory, whether by a constituent, legislative, executive, judicial or other power, whether that power holds a superior or a subordinate position in the organization of the United States, and whether that power's functions are of an international or internal character;

and that, pursuant to the foregoing international legal obligations,

(1) any criminal liability imposed on Angel Francisco Breard in violation of international legal obligations is void, and should be recognized as void by the legal authorities of the United States;

(2) the United States should restore the *status quo ante*, that is re-establish the situation that existed before the detention of, proceedings against, and conviction and sentencing of Paraguay's national in violation of the United States' international legal obligations took place; and

(3) the United States should provide Paraguay a guarantee of the non-repetition of the illegal acts."

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you. Immediately after the filing of the Application, on 3 April 1998, the Agent of Paraguay filed in the Registry of the Court a request for the indication of provisional measures pursuant to Article 73 of the Rules of Court. Paraguay stated, in that request, that

"By order dated 25 February 1998, the Circuit Court of Arlington County, Virginia, United States of America, has ordered that on 14 April 1998, pursuant to Virginia Code § 53.1-234, Mr. Breard be electrocuted or injected with a lethal substance until he is dead."

Paraguay further indicated that

> "Under the grave and exceptional circumstances of this case, and given the paramount interest of Paraguay in the life and liberty of its nationals, provisional measures are urgently needed to protect the life of Paraguay's national and the ability of this Court to order the relief to which Paraguay is entitled: restitution in kind. Without the provisional measures requested, the United States will execute Mr. Breard before this Court can consider the merits of Paraguay's claims, and Paraguay will be forever deprived of the opportunity to have the *status quo ante* restored in the event of a judgment in its favour."

It asked the Court to treat the matter as one of "the greatest urgency" in view of "the extreme gravity and immediacy of the threat".

I will now ask the Registrar to read out the provisional measures which the Agent of Paraguay, in paragraph 8 of the request, asks the Court to indicate.

The REGISTRAR:

> "On behalf of the Government of Paraguay I therefore respectfully request that, pending final judgment in this case, the Court indicate:
>
> *(a)* That the Government of the United States take the measures necessary to ensure that Mr. Breard not be executed pending the disposition of this case;
>
> *(b)* That the Government of the United States report to the Court the actions it has taken in pursuance of subparagraph *(a)* immediately above and the results of those actions; and
>
> *(c)* That the Government of the United States ensure that no action is taken that might prejudice the rights of the Republic of Paraguay with respect to any decision this Court may render on the merits of the case."

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Immediately upon the filing of the Request, the certified copy of the Request for the indication of provisional measures to which reference is made in Article 73, paragraph 2 of the Rules of Court, was transmitted to the Government of the United States.

Immediately upon the filing of the Request, letters were sent by the Vice-President of the Court to each of the Parties, pursuant to Article 74, paragraph 4, of the Rules of Court, drawing their attention to the need to act in such a way as to enable any Order the Court might make on the request for provisional measures to have its appropriate effects.

According to Article 74 of the Rules of Court, a request for the indication of provisional measures "shall have priority over all other cases" and if the Court is not sitting when the request is made, it is to be convened forthwith for the purpose of proceeding to a decision on that request. Moreover, the date of the oral proceedings must be fixed in such a way as to afford the Parties the opportunity of being represented at it. Consequently, following a meeting held between the Vice-President and the representatives of both Parties on the date the request was filed, the Parties were informed that the date for the oral proceedings contemplated by Article 74, paragraph 3, of the Rules of Court, during which they could present their observations on the request for the indication of provisional measures, had been fixed as 7 April 1998 at 10 a.m.

I note the presence in Court of Agents and Counsel of the two Parties. The Court will first hear the Republic of Paraguay, the Applicant on the merits and the State which has requested the indication of provisional measures. I accordingly give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Manuel Cáceres, Agent of Paraguay.

Mr. CACERES:

1. Introduction

Mr. President, Mr. Vice-President and distinguished Members of the Court. My name is Manuel María Cáceres. I am the Agent for the Government of the Republic of Paraguay in this case.

2. Attempts to Resolve Dispute

Paraguay recognizes the busy schedule of this Court. Paraguay therefore deeply appreciates the Court's willingness to convene on this request for provisional measures on such short notice.

Paraguay further recognizes that, given its national, Angel Francisco Breard, is scheduled to be executed exactly one week from today, the Court must act with great alacrity if its decision on Paraguay's request for provisional measures is to have any effect. Again, Paraguay deeply

appreciates the deliberative efforts that the Court and its Members will now be required to devote to our request.

I therefore wish to assure the Court that Paraguay has filed this Application and asserted this request for provisional measures only after exhaustive efforts to resolve this dispute without intervention of this Court. As detailed in Paraguay's Application, Paraguay has attempted to resolve the dispute not only through diplomatic negotiations, but also by taking the unusual step of pursuing relief through the municipal court system of the United States of America. None of these avenues has proved fruitful.

Just last week, Paraguay and the United States resumed efforts in the form of a series of high-level meetings in Asunción, which both parties hoped would make it possible to avoid recourse to this Court.

To our regret, however, no resolution has been achieved. Thus, as the Court knows, we initiated proceedings last Friday and have asked the Court to indicate provisional measures that will ensure that Paraguay's national is not executed during the pendency of these proceedings.

3. Introduction of Counsel

To make Paraguay's oral submission in support of its Application for provisional measures, I now introduce Professor José Emilio Gorostiaga, Professor of Law at the University of Paraguay and Legal Counsel to the Office of the President of Paraguay. I also introduce Mr. Donald Francis Donovan of Debevoise & Plimpton in New York, and Mr. Barton Legum also of Debevoise & Plimpton in New York and Mr. Don Malone as well of the same law firm.

Mr. Donovan will commence our oral submissions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you. Mr. Donovan, please.

Mr. DONOVAN:

II. SUMMARY, TREATIES, AND JURISDICTION

1. Introduction and Summary

Mr. President, Mr. Vice-President, and distinguished Members of the Court.

We are acutely aware of the time pressure under which the Court takes up this matter in light of the scheduled execution of Angel Francisco Breard, Paraguay's national, on 14 April, this coming Tuesday. In our scheduling meeting on Friday, the Court made it clear that it wished us to keep our oral submissions as brief as possible, and if at all possible to no more than one hour. We will certainly respect that request.

This case facilitates a succinct submission as it arrives at this Court, the case presents a straightforward dispute both as a matter of the underlying facts and of the governing principles of law. We believe as well that the circumstances relevant to our request for provisional measures — most importantly, of course, the impending execution — are also plain to see. Accordingly, we are confident that the need for real expedition in this matter will not in any way compromise the Parties' opportunity to present their observations to the Court.

I will begin Paraguay's oral submissions by setting forth the treaty provisions from which Paraguay's claims arise and the jurisdictional basis for those claims.

My colleague Mr. Legum will then set forth the facts out of which the claims arise.

I will then address the Application for provisional measures in light of the present posture of the dispute.

And finally, Dr. Gorostiaga will briefly elaborate on the importance Paraguay attaches to the interests at stake in this matter.

2. Substantive Treaty Rights at Issue

Paraguay bases its Application in this Court on the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, to which both Paraguay and the United States are parties. The Convention, as this Court well

knows, is the modern cornerstone of consular rights and privileges, but it is a cornerstone that rests on centuries of accumulated experience.

Article 5 *(e)* of the Vienna Convention includes protecting the interests of a sending State's nationals and providing consular assistance to nationals of the State as among the consular functions protected by the Convention.

Article 36 implements certain provisions of Article 5 *(e)* in the case of detained nationals. Paragraph 1 of Article 36 provides a detailed procedural mechanism to be followed in all cases where a national is detained by another State party.

Subparagraph *(a)* of paragraph 1 establishes the guiding principle of free consular access — that is, consular officers of the sending State must have free access to and communication with nationals of that State, and nationals must have free access to and communication with their consular officers. That is the very basis of the means by which consular assistance is provided.

Subparagraph *(b)* establishes the precise procedure to be followed when a national of the sending State is detained by the competent authorities of the receiving State. Specifically, the authorities of the receiving State must "without delay" inform the national of his or her right to consular assistance and to have the consul advised of the detention. Further, if the national so requests, the authorities must "without delay" inform the consular post of the sending State. Finally, any communication by the national to the consular post must be forwarded to the authorities, again "without delay".

Subparagraph *(c)* describes the consular officers' procedural rights with respect to detained nationals. They have the right to visit and to correspond and to converse and to arrange for legal representation.

Paragraph 2 of Article 36 provides that all of these rights "shall be exercised in conformity with the laws and regulations of the receiving State". That provision, however, is subject to the proviso that "the said laws and regulations must enable full effect to be given to the purposes for which the rights accorded under the Article are intended". Thus, while States have the authority

to regulate the means by which consular rights are exercised, the municipal laws and regulations cannot operate to deprive the consular officers or the national of the rights granted; to the contrary, the proviso — which was adopted over an alternative that would have permitted substantial dilution of the rights granted by way of municipal law requirements — makes clear that the municipal laws must ensure that "full effect" be given to such rights.

I should point out that Article 36 in Paraguay's view creates rights not only for the State party, but also for the detained national.

And as the Court will have noted, Paraguay in this case seeks redress for both categories of rights. It brings the action on its own behalf for violations of rights owed to it, and it also brings the action in the exercise of diplomatic protection in light of the breach of duties owed to its national.

3. Jurisdiction

Finally, the Vienna Convention includes an Optional Protocol, again to which both Paraguay and the United States are parties.

Article I of the Protocol provides that "[d]isputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention shall lie within the compulsory jurisdiction" of this Court, the Application may be brought by any party to the dispute being a party to the Protocol.

I will address jurisdiction more fully after Mr. Legum has advised the Court of the relevant facts. For the moment, I simply wish to point out that Paraguay founds jurisdiction in this case on Article I of the Optional Protocol.

I turn now to Mr. Legum.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr. Donovan. Mr. Legum, please.

Mr. LEGUM:

III. FACTS

1. Introduction

Mr. President, Mr. Vice-President and distinguished Members of the Court. I will this morning summarize the facts and proceedings in the United States concerning the case of Angel Francisco Breard.

2. The Crime and the Arrest

Mr. Breard is a Paraguayan national. In 1986, at the age of 20, he left Paraguay to reside in the United States.

On 1 September 1992, Mr. Breard was arrested by law enforcement authorities of the Commonwealth of Virginia, one of the States of the United States. Mr. Breard was suspected to have raped and murdered a Virginia woman named Ruth Dickie.

Neither at the time Mr. Breard was arrested, nor at any point thereafter, did Virginia law enforcement authorities inform him of his right to receive consular assistance from the Paraguayan consulate. Nor did they ever advise the Paraguayan consulate of his detention. Neither the Virginia authorities nor the United States contend otherwise.

The Virginia authorities did not provide Paraguay the opportunity to consult with Mr. Breard and arrange for appropriate legal representation. Instead, the Virginia court itself appointed counsel for Mr. Breard. The lawyers appointed by the court were familiar with the Virginia criminal justice system. They had no familiarity, however, with the justice system or culture of Paraguay and were not equipped to address misconceptions concerning the functioning of the American justice system that a Paraguayan national might be expected to have.

3. The Trial and Sentence

Virginia brought Mr. Breard to trial and determined to seek the death penalty.

As a result of the lack of consular assistance, Mr. Breard made a number of objectively unreasonable decisions during the course of the criminal proceedings against him.

Perhaps most important, he rejected a plea offer that the Virginia authorities made before trial. The Virginia authorities offered to recommend a sentence of life imprisonment if Mr. Breard would plead guilty to the charges against him. Against the advice of his court-appointed attorneys, Mr. Breard rejected that offer.

Instead, Mr. Breard waived his right not to incriminate himself, took the witness stand and confessed to the murders. These actions ruled out any possibility that Mr. Breard would receive an acquittal and subjected him to one of three possible penalties under Virginia law: life imprisonment, life imprisonment with a $100,000 fine against him or the death penalty.

Therefore, in rejecting the plea offer and confessing at trial, Mr. Breard exposed himself to the risk of a death sentence without any possibility of receiving a lighter sentence than what the Virginia authorities had offered to him in the plea offer before trial.

Mr. Breard's decision to confess and reject the plea offer was based on a misunderstanding of the United States justice system and how it differed from the Paraguayan justice system. Where a confession at trial might appeal to the mercy of a Paraguayan court, such a confession in the Virginia trial served only to seal Mr. Breard's fate.

Paraguayan consular officers are familiar with the characteristics of both justice systems, understand the misconceptions of Paraguayan nationals about the United States justice system and are skilled in explaining the differences in terms that Paraguay nationals can understand. Had a Paraguayan consular officer been permitted to assist Mr. Breard, the officer would have provided Mr. Breard with information that would have enabled him to make more informed decisions in the conduct of his defence.

Even with Mr. Breard's confession at trial, the jury found it a close question whether to apply the death penalty. The jury transmitted a note to the trial judge enquiring whether it could sentence Mr. Breard to life in prison and at the same time recommend that he not be released on parole. Because such a sentence was not provided for under Virginia law at the time, the judge did not respond to the note.

At the conclusion of the 1993 trial, the jury found Mr. Breard guilty of the murder, and he was sentenced to death. Had he had the assistance of Paraguayan consular officers, that result would have been different, at least with respect to the sentence.

4. Post-Conviction

Mr. Breard appealed his conviction and sentence to Virginia's appellate courts. His appeals were denied. He also petitioned the state courts of Virginia for relief from his detention by way of a writ of *habeas corpus*. That petition was also denied.

In sum, Mr. Breard was detained, tried, convicted, sentenced to death and had exhausted all of the remedies available to him in the state courts of Virginia without ever receiving the notification and consular assistance to which he was entitled under Article 36 of the Vienna Convention.

In the spring of 1996, without benefit of information from the authorities of Virginia and the United States, Paraguay finally learned that Mr. Breard was imprisoned in Virginia and awaiting execution. Paraguayan and consular officers immediately began rendering assistance to Mr. Breard.

At the time Paraguay first contacted Mr. Breard, he was entirely unaware of his rights under the Vienna Convention. He was unaware of those rights precisely because the authorities of the United States had failed to comply with their obligation to notify him of his rights under the Vienna Convention.

In late August 1996, Mr. Breard took the final step available to him for challenging his conviction and sentence: filing a petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* in a federal court of first instance. For the first time, Mr. Breard raised violations of the Vienna Convention.

In November 1996, the federal court of first instance denied Mr. Breard's petition for *habeas corpus*. The court held under the municipal law doctrine of procedural default, Mr. Breard could not assert the violations of the Vienna Convention as a basis relief in the federal *habeas* proceedings because he had not done so in his prior legal proceedings.

The court held the doctrine to bar his Vienna Convention claims even though he had failed to raise those claims not through any choice on his part, but rather because the Virginia authorities had failed to notify him of his rights as required by the Convention.

The intermediate federal appellate court affirmed the lower court's decision on 22 January 1998. This affirmance exhausted all of the municipal law remedies available to Mr. Breard as a matter of right.

In light of the exhaustion of such remedies, by order dated 25 February 1998 the Virginia court that had sentenced Mr. Breard set an execution date of 14 April 1998.

Mr. Breard is scheduled to be moved on Friday 10 April 1998, from the maximum security prison where he is currently incarcerated to the facility in another town of Virginia where the execution chamber is housed. Absent intervention, at 9 p.m. one week from today Virginia will, in the words of the authorizing statute, "cause the prisoner under sentence of death to be electrocuted or injected with a lethal substance until he is dead" (Va. Stat. Ann. § 53.1 234).

5. Breard's Petition to the Supreme Court

Mr. Breard has now petitioned the United States Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari and requested a stay of his execution.

Several aspects of the procedure in the Supreme Court are important to understand.

First, review in the Supreme Court is not a matter of right but is a matter of discretion rarely exercised. Less than five percent of all petitions for certiorari are granted. The situation is no different in cases involving the death penalty: prisoners facing execution routinely petition the Court and request a stay, and the Court routinely denies.

Second, in cases involving an imminent execution, the Supreme Court typically does not rule on the petition and request for a stay of execution until shortly before the scheduled execution. Often the decision is communicated telephonically to the petitioner a few hours before the execution.

I now turn to Mr. Donovan to set forth Paraguay's Application for provisional measures.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Legum. Mr. Donovan please.

Mr. DONOVAN:

IV. NEED FOR PROVISIONAL MEASURES

Paraguay asks this Court to direct the United States to ensure that Mr. Breard is not executed until the Court has had the opportunity to rule on Paraguay's claims under the Vienna Convention as presented in its Application instituting proceedings. In Paraguay's view, the impending execution of Mr. Breard on the basis of a criminal proceeding that it is acknowledged by the competent authorities of the United States did not comply with the requirements of the Vienna Convention establishes the need for provisional measures in this case with unusual clarity.

I will set forth Paraguay's Application in four steps. First, I will demonstrate the Court's jurisdiction. Second, we will discuss the relationship of the provisional measures sought to the rights Paraguay seeks to vindicate in this matter in order to show that the measures sought are the minimum necessary to preserve the possibility of an effective final judgment. Third, we will describe the circumstances that establish the urgency of the Application, and finally, I will set forth the basis of Paraguay's claim that it faces irreversible damage.

First, the matter Paraguay brings to this Court is plainly a "dispute arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention". As Mr. Legum explained, neither the United States nor the competent authorities of the Commonwealth of Virginia have ever suggested that Virginia officials complied with Article 36 of the Vienna Convention when they prosecuted Mr. Breard for capital murder. Paraguay has sought relief for the violation from the United States for the past 18 months, both through diplomatic channels and — although it was under no obligation to do so — through the municipal court system in the United States.

The United States, however, has taken no steps to remedy the violation. In particular, the United States has taken no steps to halt the impending execution of Paraguay's national on the basis of a conviction and sentence obtained in violation of the Convention. As a result, the parties have

a dispute within Article I of the Optional Protocol, and the Court is competent to hear Paraguay's Application.

The Court's authority to go forward on this Application for provisional measures becomes even clearer when one takes into account the principle, which this Court has stated on numerous occasions, that on an application for provisional measures the Court need not finally satisfy itself of its jurisdiction but may — given the very nature of provisional measures — proceed on the basis of a prima facie showing. Paraguay respectfully submits that the existence prima facie of jurisdiction under Article I is clear.

Second, the provisional measures Paraguay seeks are appropriate in light of its claims. Specifically, the measures Paraguay seeks are both *conservatory* and *conservative*.

This Court has often stated that the objective of provisional measures must be to "preserve the respective rights of the parties pending the decision of the Court". Here, Paraguay claims, a violation of Article 36 of the Vienna Convention. Paraguay claims that it suffered injury from that violation in the form of a conviction rendered against, and sentence of death imposed upon, its national.

To remedy the violation, Paraguay seeks restitution in kind and an order of non-repetition.

As to restitution, in the classic formulation of the Chorzow Court, the author of an internationally wrongful act has an obligation "as far as possible, [to] wipe out all the consequences of the illegal act and re-establish the situation which would, in all probability, have existed if that act had not been committed". Article 43 of the ILC's Draft Articles on State Responsibility is to similar effect. In its formulation the injured State is entitled to "the re-establishment of the situation which existed before the wrongful act was committed".

In this case, the re-establishment of the prior situation will require an order against the enforcement of the conviction and sentence. It may also require for example, an order directing that the plea offer which would have permitted Mr. Breard to avoid the death sentence be reconveyed.

Obviously, no such orders could have any effect if Virginia has executed Mr. Breard in the meantime.

Likewise, as to non-repetition, Paraguay will seek an order requiring the United States to ensure compliance with the Vienna Convention should Virginia choose to retry Mr. Breard, as Paraguay expects it would. That order, too, would be useless if Mr. Breard has been executed.

Clearly, then, an order directing the United States to ensure that Mr. Breard is not executed during the pendency of this proceeding is necessary to preserve Paraguay's rights in the controversy.

The Court has also stated that provisional measures should not "anticipate" the Court's judgment on the merits. As an initial matter, I should note that the relief that Paraguay seeks on the merits in this case is carefully restrained. Paraguay does not contend that Mr. Breard is not subject to re-trial or to future prosecution for the acts with which he was charged. The fundamental contention of Paraguay is that in any such re-trial Paraguay's rights and Mr. Breard's rights under the Vienna Convention must be respected. Likewise, the provisional measures that Paraguay seeks are carefully limited and in no way anticipate a judgment. Paraguay does not ask, for example, that Mr. Breard be afforded a new trial at this time, or that his conviction and sentence be in any way affected except that the death sentence — the execution — be provisionally suspended. Mr. Breard will remain in custody, and if the United States prevails on the merits in this case, Virginia will be able to go forward with the execution. Thus, the United States can complain of no harm if the Court orders the narrowly tailored provisional measures that Paraguay seeks.

Third, the Court has also said that provisional measures should issue only in situations of urgency. There can be no question of urgency here. As Mr. Legum has explained, neither Paraguay nor this Court can act on the assumption that the Supreme Court will grant a writ of certiorari or stay of the execution in Mr. Breard's case. As we have explained, Paraguay too has sought relief in the municipal courts of the United States. At the moment Paraguay too, in its own right and asserting only its own rights, also has a petition for certiorari pending before the United States Supreme Court and accompanying that petition it has filed an application for a stay of or

injunction against the execution. But the same situation that Mr. Legum explained with respect to Mr. Breard's own petition obtains with respect to Paraguay's petition. We believe that the petition is compelling, but we must recognize that the Supreme Court grants very few petitions, and there is no possible way to predict in the case of any individual petition whether or not it will do so.

The nature of the provisional measures that are necessary here, considered in light of the constitutional structure of the United States, adds an additional element of urgency. The order of execution is an order of a State court, that of the Commonwealth of Viriginia. While the United States plainly has the ability to comply with any order the Court may issue by obtaining a stay of the Virginia court's order of execution, it will need to intervene with State authorities in order to do so, and it may, if it is so advised, choose to call upon a federal court. In other words, unlike some other situations, if the Court indicates provisional measures forbidding the execution, the federal executive branch to which any order would first be communicated will need to act affirmatively in order to bring the United States in compliance with that indication of provisional measures. It will not be sufficient for the United States, at least in the form of its federal executive branch, simply to refrain from taking certain action. For that reason there is an additional need, with the greatest respect, for the Court to act quickly.

Finally, this Court has stated that the authority to grant provisional measures "presupposes that irreparable prejudice should not be caused to rights which are the subject of dispute in judicial proceedings". In other words, the Court has required a showing of irreparable injury or irreversible damage in some sense as a predicate to an indication of provisional measures. In Paraguay's view, I need not dwell on this requirement here. Needless to say, death is irreparable, irreversible and, in a very fundamental sense, irremediable. In considering requests from death-row prisoners for stays of their execution, the United States Supreme Court has held, without reservation, that in cases involving an execution, the equitable requirement of irreparable injury in seeking the equitable intervention of a stay or injunction is a given. Now that a death penalty case has reached this Court, it should be no different here.

The crimes with which Mr. Breard are charged deserve the most unequivocal condemnation. On the present state of affairs, individual states of the United States have the authority to express that condemnation in the form of the penalty of death. But even if the death penalty may still be lawfully imposed as a matter of sanction, courts entrusted to uphold the rule of law — on the international level no less than on the municipal level — must be vigilant to ensure the lawfulness, too, of the proceedings by which that penalty is imposed. To exercise that vigilance here, the Court must first indicate to the United States that it must ensure that Paraguay's national is not executed while this case is before the Court.

Dr. Gorostiaga will conclude Paraguay's submissions.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr. Donovan. Dr. Gorostiaga, please.

Mr. GOROSTIAGA:

V. CONCLUSIONS

Mr. Vice-President, Mr. President, and distinguished Members of the Court.

My colleagues have explained the importance of consular assistance in general. I wish very briefly to highlight the importance of consular assistance in this case in particular.

The United States is one of a relatively small group of countries that still impose the death penalty. Paraguay's Constitution, by contrast, expressly forbids the death penalty and guarantees the right to life.

The severity and irreversible nature of the death penalty greatly increase the importance of consular assistance in all cases in which it is sought. There is an enormous qualitative difference between a term of imprisonment and death: a case in which the death penalty is sought against a foreign national implicates to the maximum extent possible the foreign State's interest in protecting its nationals.

Such a case therefore brings into play in the most concrete and immediate way the sending State's right to provide consular assistance.

I wish to conclude by stating that Paraguay, of course, does not condone in any way the violent crime with which Mr. Breard was charged.

Further, Paraguay does not contest in any way the authority of the United States or its constituent entities to enforce its criminal laws with respect to this or any other crime committed within its jurisdiction.

Paraguay does contend, however, that the competent authorities of the United States must enforce its criminal laws by means that comport with the obligations undertaken by the United States in the Vienna Convention.

That was not done in the case of Angel Breard.

Paraguay today requests that this Court indicate provisional measures to ensure that the possibility will remain for Paraguay to exercise its rights under that Convention in Mr. Breard's case.

Thank you.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you Dr. Gorostiaga.

The Court will now adjourn for ten minutes and resume again to hear the submissions of the United States.

The Court adjourned from 11.00 to 11.15 a.m.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Please be seated. The Court now resumes its sitting to hear the submissions of the United States of America.

Mr. ANDREWS: Thank you Mr. President, Members of the Court. Before I begin my presentation I would like to express the pleasure of the United States delegation at seeing Judge Kooijmans again sitting with the Court.

1.1. Mr. President, it is again an honour to appear before the Court, although I regret that it must be in a matter so hurried and involving facts so unhappy as those involved here.

1.2. As the Court well knows, Paraguay filed this case four days ago. Because of Paraguay's decision to file at such a late date, the Court decided to hold a hearing today on Paraguay's request for provisional measures. Out of our respect for the Court, we have of course come here urgently to participate in these proceedings. This morning, we will present our reasons why the Court should not indicate provisional measures. Given the extraordinary haste of these proceedings, however, our presentations will be less fully developed than we would like. We regret the unfortunate circumstances that have led to this expedited proceeding, which prejudices not just the United States, but the ability of the Court to consider the issues before it fully and fairly. We likewise regret the fact that Paraguay has chosen to disregard the two-month period provided in the Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention for the possible resolution of such disputes through conciliation or arbitration.

1.3. The facts of the criminal indictment underlying this case are straightforward; indeed, we should all be clear that Mr. Breard unquestionably committed the offences for which he was tried. On 17 February 1992, Mr. Breard attempted to rape and then brutally murdered Ruth Dickie, a woman in Arlington, Virginia, a suburban jurisdiction across the Potomac River from Washington D.C. He was then arrested while attempting another rape. As we shall explain, genetic and other physical evidence linked Mr. Breard to the murder and the attempted rape. Indeed, ample evidence independent of his own testimony existed to prove that Mr. Breard committed these crimes. Mr. Breard was also implicated in a third sexual assault committed before he murdered Ms Dickie.

1.4. The Arlington police took Mr. Breard into custody and charged him with serious offences. The Commonwealth of Virginia has stipulated in United States court proceedings that the "competent authorities" did not inform Breard that, as a national of Paraguay, he was entitled to have Paraguay's consul notified of his arrest. Under Article 36 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, the police were obliged to tell Mr. Breard that the consul could be so notified.

1.5. Mr. Breard had lived in the United States since 1986 and speaks English well, he was appointed experienced criminal defence counsel, and was able to maintain close and regular contact with friends and family. Given the circumstances and gravity of his crime, the jury recommended that he be sentenced to death, and the judge did so. Thereafter, Mr. Breard's attorneys brought a number of further actions in Virginia state courts and in United States courts seeking reversal of his conviction and sentence. This process has continued for almost five years, involving actions in different courts in the United States, including the United States Supreme Court, where Breard's request for certiorari — in other words, discretionary review by the Supreme Court — is still pending today.

1.6. As this Court knows, the indication of provisional measures is a serious matter which the Court is cautious in exercising. That is especially true in this case, where the Court is being asked to take action that would severely intrude upon the national criminal jurisdiction of a State in a matter of violent crime. Under the Court's jurisprudence, an applicant may only obtain the indication of provisional measures of protection in narrowly-defined circumstances, which the United States submits do not exist here.

1.7. The United States principal submission to the Court is that Paraguay has no legal recognizable claim to the relief it seeks and, for that reason, there is no prima facie basis for jurisdiction for the Court in this case, nor any prospect for Paraguay ultimately to prevail on the merits. Consequently, and in accordance with its jurisprudence, this Court should not indicate provisional measures of protection as requested by Paraguay.

1.8. Paraguay has no legally recognizable claim because Paraguay has no right under the Vienna Convention to have Mr. Breard's conviction and sentence voided. Paraguay in effect asks that this Court grant Mr. Breard a new trial — a right which would then presumably accrue to any other person similarly situated in the United States or in any other State which is a party to the Vienna Convention. The United States will show in these proceedings that this is not the

consequence of a lack of notification under the Vienna Convention. The Court should not accept Paraguay's invitation to rewrite the Convention and to become a supreme court of criminal appeals.

1.9. Before describing the manner in which the United States will proceed in its presentation, I feel obliged to make a few comments about the issue of the death penalty in the United States. In a majority of the states of the United States (thirty-eight), including Virginia, voters have chosen through their freely elected officials to retain the death penalty for exceptionally grievous offences. Likewise, the United States itself authorizes the death penalty for exceptionally grievous federal offences. In practice, it is imposed, almost without exception, only for aggravated murder, as well as the case here. In all cases, the death penalty may be carried out only under substantive laws in effect at the time the crime was committed. All convictions and sentences involving the death penalty are subject to the extensive due process and equal protection requirements of the United States Constitution. They are also subject to exhaustive appeals at the state and federal levels, as has been the case with Mr. Breard.

1.10. When carried out in accordance with these safeguards, the death penalty does not violate international law. Capital punishment is not prohibited by customary international law or by any treaty to which the United States is a party. We recognize that some countries have abolished the death penalty under their domestic laws and that some have accepted treaty obligations to that effect. We respect their decisions. However, we also believe that in democratic societies, the criminal justice system, including the punishments prescribed for the most serious crimes, should reflect the will of the people freely expressed and appropriately implemented by their elected representatives. Within the United States, legislative majorities nationally and in most of the constituent states have chosen to retain the option of capital punishment for the most serious crimes.

1.11. Many other countries likewise maintain capital punishment. On the same day that Paraguay filed this case, 3 April, the Commission on Human Rights in Geneva adopted a resolution that encouraged States that have the death penalty to establish a moratorium on executions. This resolution passed, but by a sharply divided vote of 26 in favour and 13 against, with 12 abstaining.

This action reflects the diversity of views held in the international community concerning capital punishment.

1.12. Capital punishment is not the issue in the dispute between the United States and Paraguay. The actual issues are quite different. They are very narrow. They relate to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, to which both the United States and Paraguay are parties.

1.13. As is customary, Mr. President, the United States will not read the full citations that support our arguments, but they are included in the texts provided to the Court and to opposing counsel. Further, I wish to note that the United States reserves the right to make additional arguments regarding issues of jurisdiction or the merits of this case that are not made today for purposes of this proceeding. Our presentation will proceed as follows. Ms Catherine Brown, the Department of State's Assistant Legal Adviser for Consular Affairs, will discuss the nature of the consular function and the practice of States with regard to consular notification and the remedies when notification is not provided. She will also describe in some detail the underlying facts of Mr. Breard's case and the efforts of the United States once it became aware of the case.

1.14. Ms Brown will be followed by Mr. John Crook, the State Department's Assistant Legal Adviser for United Nations Affairs. Mr. Crook will discuss the legal factors that should guide the Court in determining whether it should indicate provisional measures and will apply those factors to this case to show that provisional measures are not warranted. In doing so, he will discuss the text of the Vienna Convention, it negotiating history, and relevant subsequent practice.

1.15. Mr. Matheson, the State Department's Principal Deputy Legal Adviser and Co-Agent in this case, will address additional, prudential reasons for the Court not to issue provisional measures in this case, by noting the problems that would be created were the Court to assume the role asked by Paraguay.

1.16. After Mr. Matheson's presentation, I will return to the podium to provide a brief closing. Thank you, Mr. President. I ask you now to invite Ms Brown to the podium.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Andrews. I give the floor now to Ms Catherine Brown.

Ms BROWN: Mr. President, Members of the Court,

2.1. It is a privilege and honor to be appearing before this Court for the first time.

2.2. My task is to explain to the Court the factual background of this dispute. I will review how the United States has responded to the concerns expressed by the Government of Paraguay, including the results of our investigation into the facts of Mr. Breard's case. First, however, I will address the nature of the consular function and the practice of States with regard to consular notification, in so far as those facts are relevant to the issues of this case.

I. The Consular Function

2.3. The principal function of consular officers is to provide services and assistance to their country's nationals abroad. The Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, to which both the United States and Paraguay are parties, enumerates a wide range of general consular functions in Article 5. Article 36 addresses the specific issue of consular officers communicating with their nationals abroad.

2.4. Article 36, paragraph 1 *(a)*, provides that consular officials shall be free to communicate with their nationals and to have access to them. This case does not involve a deliberate interference with Paraguay's right to communicate with its national, Angel Breard. Moreover, since Paraguayan consular officials became aware of Mr. Breard's detention, they have been able to communicate and visit with him.

2.5. Article 36, paragraph 1 *(b)*, provides that a detained foreign national shall be permitted without delay to communicate with the relevant consular post and that competent authorities will advise the consular post of the foreign national's detention without delay if the detainee so requests. There is no serious question in this case that Mr. Breard could at any time have communicated with

a Paraguayan consular official, either directly or through his family or his attorneys, had he known and chosen to do so.

2.6. Article 36, paragraph 1 *(b)*, concludes with the "consular notification" obligation that is at issue in this case: it provides that "the said authorities shall inform the person concerned without delay of his rights under this paragraph". Virginia authorities apparently did not so advise Mr. Breard, at the time of his arrest, or at any time prior to his conviction and sentence, that he could communicate with a consular official. But that does not mean that he was impeded or dissuaded from obtaining consular assistance. He, or his family, or his attorneys, might at any time have enlisted the assistance of a consul, as is frequently the case. The option of calling one's embassy or consul for help is widely known, and many governments advise their own nationals to call their embassy or consul in an emergency abroad.

2.7. Article 36, paragraph 1 *(c)*, provides that consular officials may visit their nationals in detention, converse and correspond with them, and arrange for their legal representation. Again, there was no deliberate effort to interfere with this right, and since becoming aware of Mr. Breard's detention Paraguayan consular officials have been able to visit and communicate with him. With respect to legal representation, arrangements were made by the State of Virginia for two clearly competent lawyers to represent Mr. Breard. Thus a consul proved unnecessary to perform this function.

2.8. Finally, Article 36, paragraph 1 *(c)*, concludes that a consular officer shall refrain from taking action on behalf of a national who is in prison if he expressly opposes such action. This provision is of particular interest here because Mr. Breard did not accept — indeed he adamantly resisted and even rejected — the advice not only of his attorneys, but also of his mother a Paraguayan national.

2.9. Several additional points are noteworthy. First, neither Article 5 nor Article 36 imposes any obligations on consular officers themselves. A consular officer may or may not choose to undertake any particular function on behalf of his countrymen. Consequently, the practice of

States — and even of individual consuls — in assisting their nationals varies widely. Some countries are very active, while others are passive or even quite frankly uninterested or unable to provide any significant consular assistance. A country may have just one or two consular officials in a capital city, and none at a more remote location. A country's consular officials may make frequent prison visits or visit only selectively, if at all. Each country decides for itself what it will do. This in turn creates expectations among its nationals as to whether seeking consular assistance would be worthwhile.

2.10. Second, nothing in these Articles elevates the rights of foreign nationals above those of citizens of the host country. A foreign national is expected to obey the host country's laws, and is subject to its criminal justice system. Consular officers assist their nationals within this context. Consistent with this, Article 5 *(i)* of the Vienna Convention limits the rights of consular officers to represent or to arrange representation of their nationals before the tribunals of the receiving State. They may do so only "subject to the practices and procedures obtaining in the receiving State". The United States does not permit foreign consular officials to act as attorneys in the United States, nor may its own consular officers abroad act as attorneys for American citizens. We believe that this is the general practice of States.

2.11. Third, the Vienna Convention does not make consular assistance an essential element of the host country's criminal justice system. This is inevitable, given that consular officers have no obligations to act in any particular way vis-à-vis a host country's criminal justice system. A consul may do nothing at all, leaving the justice system to run its course. Or, the consul may visit the detainee; may ensure that the detainee's family is aware of the detention; may assist the detainee in securing counsel, if necessary; and may follow developments so that any questions about the fairness of the proceedings can, if appropriate, be discussed with host country officials. But the consular officer is not responsible for the defence because he cannot act as an attorney.

II. State Practice With Respect to Consular Notification

2.12. Two additional aspects of state practice are relevant: how faithfully do governments provide notification and what remedies, if any, are provided by governments for failures to notify? Because it is important that the United States respond appropriately to allegations of violations of consular notification, the Department of State recently made inquiries to all of our Embassies and, through them, directly to governments on these matters. While our information remains incomplete, we believe that it fairly reflects the range of state practice.

2.13. Practice with respect to notification: Compliance with respect to the obligation to notify the detainee of the right to see a consul in fact varies widely. At one end of the spectrum, some countries seem to comply unfailingly. At the other end, a small number seem not to comply at all. Rates of compliance seem partly to be a function of such factors as whether a country is large or small, whether it has a unitary or federal organization, the sophistication of its internal communication systems, and the way in which the country has chosen to implement the obligation. Countries have chosen to implement the obligation in different ways, including by providing only oral guidance, by issuing internal directives, and by enacting implementing legislation. Some apparently provide no guidance at all.

2.14. If a detainee requests consular notification or communication, actual notification to a consul may take some time. It may be provided by telephone, but sometimes a letter or a diplomatic note is sent. As a result there may be a significant delay before notification is received and, consequently, critical events in a criminal proceeding may have already occurred before a consul is aware of the detention. And, as noted previously, the consul may then respond in a variety of ways. For these reasons, and because of the wide variation in compliance with the consular notification requirement, it is quite likely that few, if any, states would have agreed to Article 36 if they had understood that a failure to comply with consular notification would require undoing the results of their criminal justice systems.

2.15. Practice with respect to remedies: Let me turn now to what our inquiries revealed about state practice with respect to remedies. Typically when a consular officer learns of a failure of notification, a diplomatic communication is sent protesting the failure. While such correspondence sometimes goes unanswered, more often it is investigated either by the foreign ministry or the involved law enforcement officials. If it is learned that notification in fact was not given, it is common practice for the host government to apologize and to undertake to ensure improved future compliance. We are not aware of any practice of attempting to ascertain whether the failure of notification prejudiced the foreign national in criminal proceedings. This lack of practice is consistent with the fact and common international understanding that consular assistance is not essential to the criminal proceeding against a foreign national.

2.16. Notwithstanding this practice, Paraguay asks that the entire judicial process of the State of Virginia — Mr. Breard's trial, his sentence, and all of the subsequent appeals, which I will review momentarily — be set aside and that he be restored to the position he was in at the time of his arrest because of the failure of notification. Roughly 165 States are parties to the Vienna Convention. Paraguay has not identified *one* that provides such a *status quo ante* remedy of vacating a criminal conviction for a failure of consular notification. Neither has Paraguay identified any country that has an established judicial remedy whereby a foreign government can seek to undo a conviction in its domestic courts based on a failure of notification.

2.17. In the United States today, foreign nationals and the Government of Paraguay are attempting to have our courts recognize such a remedy as a matter of United States domestic law. But if our courts do so, the United States will become, as far as we are aware, the first country in the world to permit such a result. A number of foreign ministries have advised us that this result would certainly or most likely not be possible in their countries.

2.18. It is not difficult to imagine why such remedies do not exist. As noted, consular assistance, unlike legal assistance, is not regarded as a predicate to a criminal proceeding. Moreover, if a failure to advise a detainee of the right of consular notification *automatically*

required undoing a criminal procedure, the result would be absurd. In particular, it would be inconsistent with the wide variation that exists in the level of consular services provided by different countries. But it would be equally problematic to have a rule that a failure of consular notification required a return to the *status quo ante* only if notification would have led to a different outcome. It would be unworkable for a court to attempt to determine reliably what a consular officer would have done and whether it would have made a difference. Doing so would require access to normally inviolable consular archives and testimony from consular officials notwithstanding their usual privileges and immunities. In this case, for example, one might wish to examine Paraguay's consular instructions and practices as of the time when Mr. Breard was arrested and inquire into the resources then available to Paraguay's consular officers. Surely governments did not intend that such questions become a matter of inquiry in the courts.

III. The United States Response To The Failure of Notification

2.19. Against this background, I would now like to advise the court of the steps taken by the United States relating to this case in an effort to be responsive to Paraguay's concerns.

2.20. The United States received official notice of Mr. Breard's case in April 1996 through a diplomatic note from Paraguay's Embassy in Washington. Significantly, the note did not allege a breach of the Article 36 consular notification obligation. It did not request consultations to discuss the case. It did not ask for any United States government intervention other than to facilitate efforts to obtain information from Virginia, which the Department of State did. The Department later learned, from Mr. Breard's attorneys, that those attorneys were attempting to challenge Mr. Breard's conviction based on an apparent failure of consular notification and litigation brought by Mr. Breard.

2.21. In September 1996, Paraguay filed suit against Virginia in a federal trial court. The suit sought to restore the *status quo ante* for Mr. Breard on the theory that only such action could vindicate Paraguay's governmental rights in consular notification.

The Department of State discussed the case with representatives of Paraguay in October 1996 and later received a request from the Paraguayan Ambassador for assistance in obtaining a new trial for Mr. Breard. That request failed to provide any evidence that consular law or practice would require such a result. Nevertheless, United States officials met with counsel for Paraguay about the matter and gave the issues raised by the suit careful consideration. Ultimately, the United States concluded that Paraguay's remedy for the consular notification failure lay in diplomatic communications with the Department of State. The United States so advised both the court in which Paraguay's case was pending and Paraguay's Ambassador. The United States did not object to Mr. Breard's own efforts to raise the consular notification issues in the courts, but neither did it support them.

2.22. On 3 June 1997, the Department received another letter from the Ambassador. I note that this letter is not referenced in Paraguay's Application to this Court. In it the Ambassador advised that Paraguay thought that the dispute should be resolved in the domestic courts of the United States, and not by this Court, but that Paraguay nevertheless would agree with the United States to come to this Court. This proposal was conditioned: the domestic United States proceedings should be stayed and the United States should waive any jurisdictional objections it might have to the jurisdiction of this Court and the United States should agree to require Virginia to accept this Court's decision. Like Paraguay's previous correspondence, this letter again failed to offer any serious explanation of why the remedy Paraguay was seeking was appropriate.

2.23. The Department of State nevertheless then decided to undertake an investigation into the case. In our investigation, we received the full co-operation of Virginia and we reviewed all facts relevant to the consular notification issue. This included the critical portions of the transcript, including Mr. Breard's testimony and an affidavit from his defence lawyers concerning their efforts on his behalf.

2.24. Through this process, we learned the following relevant facts:

(1) Mr. Breard unquestionably committed the offences for which he was tried. He was arrested while attempting a rape. Genetic and other physical evidence linked him to the earlier murder and attempted rape of Ruth Dickie. Ample evidence existed to prove that Mr. Breard committed these crimes, entirely independently of his own testimony. Indeed, nothing in Paraguay's submission suggests that Mr. Breard did not commit the crimes for which he was sentenced. Paraguay instead suggests that a consular officer might have persuaded Mr. Breard to make different tactical decisions;

(2) Mr. Breard had almost immediate and thereafter continuing contact with his family. He testified that one of the first phone calls he made at the time of his arrest was to his uncle. His mother and a cousin were involved in his defence, and his mother testified at his trial. Contacting family members is normally one of the first and most important things that a consular officer does when a national is detained, but here consular assistance to accomplish this proved unnecessary;

(3) Mr. Breard first came to the United States 1986 and thus had been resident in the United States for about six years at the time of his arrest. He had been married briefly to an American. This made it difficult to accept Paraguay's contention that Mr. Breard did not understand American culture;

(4) Mr. Breard had a good command of English. His lawyers had no difficulty communicating with him in English. He testified at his trial in English and the transcript of his testimony attests to his command of the language. Mr. Breard told the judge that he had no problems with English and was comfortable speaking it. Moreover, the state would have provided an interpreter had one been needed. Thus, Paraguay's implication that Mr. Breard was tried unfairly in a language he did not understand is demonstrably false. While a consular officer might help interpret for a detained foreign national, such assistance was not needed by Mr. Breard;

(5) Mr. Breard was represented by two criminal defence lawyers experienced in death penalty litigation. They spent at least 400 hours — the equivalent of 50 days — on his case. United States courts subsequently concluded that their legal representation met the requirements of the United States Constitution for the effective assistance of counsel. These attorneys worked closely with Mr. Breard, his mother, a female cousin, and his religious counsellor from jail, who was of Bolivian origin, to prepare his defence. They communicated with Mr. Breard's personal friends to find witnesses who could testify on his behalf. They communicated with persons in Paraguay to find evidence that would assist in his defence. They arranged for the court to appoint three experts to examine Mr. Breard's mental competence, and they obtained his medical records from Paraguay and from Argentina, so as to explore fully the possibility of an insanity defence and to develop mitigation evidence. Paraguay's assertion that it could have paid for witnesses from Paraguay appears irrelevant, because both his mother and cousin came from Paraguay to assist and there is no indication that there were other witnesses who were not used because of financial constraints;

(6) Mr. Breard decided to plead "not guilty" and to testify in both the penalty and sentencing phases of his trial contrary to the advice of his legal counsel and his mother — a strategy that was clearly unwise. This is the principal tactical decision Paraguay asserts it could have changed, but it is clear that Mr. Breard was advised against it by his own lawyers and his mother, yet rejected their advice. He was fully apprised of the risks of his strategy in the context of the American legal system. Access to a consular officer, who would have been less familiar with that system than his own lawyers, would not have made Mr. Breard's tactical decisions more informed;

(7) there is no credible evidence that Mr. Breard's decision to plead "not guilty" and testify was founded on a cultural misunderstanding. He was born and lived his early years in Argentina, he went to Paraguay for his secondary education and then he came to the United States to study English. As noted, he had been in the United States for six years and married to an

American briefly. Significantly, as noted, his mother was also Paraguayan and yet she as a Paraguayan understood the error of his judgment well enough to advise him not to do what he did. And again, finally, his lawyers unequivocally explained to him that his strategy would not work. He signed a statement confirming that he was rejecting their advice and was not afraid of the outcome even if it resulted in a sentence of death;

(8) although Mr. Breard's legal counsel apparently thought that Breard had the opportunity to plead guilty in exchange for a life sentence, at best only very general preliminary discussions were held on this matter and they were never seriously pursued. Virginia officials have advised us that no actual offer of a plea agreement was ever made and that none would have been made, because of the strength of the government's case and the aggravated circumstances of the crime. Virginia would not affirmatively have agreed to a life sentence because under Virginia law a life sentence would have permitted Mr. Breard's future release. Thus Paraguay's assumption that Mr. Breard could have avoided the death penalty through a plea bargain does not withstand scrutiny;

(9) objective evidence indicates that the jury and the judge could easily have decided on the death penalty even if Mr. Breard had not testified. There was evidence that the murder was "aggravated" within the meaning of Virginia law, both by the "vileness" of the particular circumstances surrounding it and by the continuing danger that Mr. Breard posed to the community. This evidence supported imposition of the death penalty under Virginia law and the judge, who had to approve the jury's recommendation, would have known that a life sentence meant the possibility of future release;

(10) finally, Mr. Breard had the full protection of the criminal justice system. In addition to competent court appointed counsel, he had full judicial review. His conviction and sentence were reviewed and sustained by the Virginia trial court and the Virginia Supreme Court, and subsequently by a federal district court and a federal appeals court. The consular notification

issue was being raised only after these procedures had been completed, in yet two more entirely separate legal proceedings.

2.25. In July 1997, the Department reported the results of its investigation in a letter to the Ambassador. That also is not referred to in Paraguay's Application to this Court. Because it found no evidence of consular notification or access, the Department expressed deep regret that such notification apparently was not provided to Mr. Breard. The Department advised, however, that there was no basis for concluding that consular assistance would have altered the outcome. It further stated that it saw no appropriate role for this Court.

2.26. Significantly, the Government of Paraguay has never responded to that letter, either to contest its factual assumptions or to address the Department's conclusion that consular notification would not have made a difference. Even so, the United States has continued to have periodic communications and discussions about the case with Paraguay. These discussions included assurances given as recently as February of this year by senior Paraguayan government officials that they recognized that this case was unprecedented and unlikely to succeed. On 30 March, however, Paraguay unexpectedly advised the United States that it would file this suit unless the United States engaged in consultations and stayed Mr. Breard's execution. Still prepared to address in diplomatic channels any issues relating to consular notification, the United States agreed to engage in such consultations. The United States did so even though it was unable to stay the execution — which is in the hands of the United States Supreme Court and the Governor of Virginia — and even though it continues to believe that this Court is not an appropriate forum to address Paraguay's concerns.

2.27. In addition to these specific measures relating to Mr. Breard's case, the United States has also intensified its long-standing efforts to ensure that all federal, state, and local law enforcement officials in the United States are aware of and comply with the consular notification and access requirements of Article 36. Guidance on these requirements has been issued regularly by the Department of State for many years. Recently, however, the Department has issued a new

and comprehensive guidance on this subject, along with a pocket-sized reference card for law enforcement officers to carry on the street. These materials have been personally provided by the Secretary of State to the United States Attorney-General and to the Governor of every state of the United States including, of course, Virginia. They have also been provided by the Department's Legal Adviser, Mr. Andrews, to every state Attorney-General, and they are being disseminated throughout the United States. In addition, the Departments of State and Justice have begun conducting briefings on these issues for state and federal prosecutors, and law enforcement officials, focusing particularly on areas with high concentrations of foreign nationals. Through these and other efforts, the United States is both acting to correct the circumstances that led to the failure of consular notification in Mr. Breard's case and acting in a manner consistent with state practice. Nothing more is required.

2.28. Mr. President, that concludes my factual presentation of the consular issues raised by this case. I thank the Court for its attention and invite it now to call upon Mr. Crook to speak.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mrs. Brown. I call now on Mr. John Crook.

Mr. CROOK:

3.1. Mr. President, Members of the Court, it is again an honour and a pleasure for me to appear before you. My presentation will consider several important legal factors that should guide the Court in determining whether to indicate provisional measures in this case. I will show why, for a number of reasons, the Court should not indicate the measures requested by Paraguay.

I. The Significance of Provisional Measures

3.2. I must begin by underscoring the gravity and importance of the decision now before the Court. As the Court well understands, the indication of provisional measures is a matter of serious consequence. The decisions of this Court clearly show the need for caution before taking such action. This reflects, first of all, the impact on the authority and the responsibility of sovereign States that such measures may have. It also reflects the fact that such measures may be indicated

only after hurried and incomplete proceedings, and that is particularly true here where the Court is sitting to hear a case that was filed less than 96 hours ago.

3.3. It is for such reasons that the Court and commentators have stressed the exceptional nature of the Court's provisional measures power. I refer the Court, for example, to its Order in the case concerning *Aegean Sea Continental Shelf (Greece* v. *Turkey), Interim Protection, Order of 11 September 1976, (I.C.J. Reports 1976*, paras. 32 and 11) and, as Mr. Andrews indicated, the citations in all these matters are contained in the transcript we have handed to the Registry. Thoughtful opinions by individual Judges have examined the point in greater detail. I refer you to Judge Shahabuddeen's opinion in the case concerning *Passage Through the Great Belt (Finland* v. *Denmark), Provisional Measures, Order of 29 July, 1991, (I.C.J. Reports 1991*, p. 29); Judge Lachs in the *Aegean Sea Continental Shelf, Interim Protection, Order of 11 September 1976, (I.C.J. Reports 1976*, p. 20); the dissenting opinions of Judges Winiarski and Badwi Pasha in the case concerning the *Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., Interim Protection, Order of 5 July, 1951, (I.C.J. Reports 1951*, p. 97) where they observed that "[m]easures of this kind in international law are exceptional in character to an even greater extent than they are in municipal law; they may easily be considered a scarcely tolerable interference in the affairs of a sovereign State". Judge Lachs, I think, well summed up the consequences in his separate opinion in the *Aegean Sea* case: "the Court must take a restrictive view of its powers in dealing with a request for interim measures".

3.4. The basic factors guiding the Court's decision whether or not to use its exceptional power to indicate provisional measures are laid down in the Statute of the Court. Article 41 envisions that the Court will carry out two separate, although inter-related, examinations. In the interests of time, I shall not read Article 41 but I would refer the Court to it, in particular Article 41(1).

3.5. As the Court will see, that text envisions two separate lines of enquiry. First, the Court's decision whether to indicate provisional measures is to be guided by an assessment of the overall context or circumstances of the case before it. Second, any measures to be indicated are of a nature

"which ought to be taken to preserve the respective rights of either party". I shall consider each of these aspects in turn.

II. Provisional measures are not warranted in these circumstances

3.6. I shall begin by showing how provisional measures are not warranted in these circumstances. Now Article 41 shows that the Court can and should consider the totality of circumstances involved in a case in deciding whether the indication of provisional measures is appropriate. Other members of the United States team are treating some particularly relevant circumstances. The Agent of the United States, Mr. Andrews, briefly addressed issues relating to the timing of this case. He noted the prejudice, both to the United States and to the judicial process, that follows from the Applicant's decision to file its case at the time it chose to do so. Ms Brown described the facts underlying Paraguay's claim, showing how it departs from the realities of international consular practice. She also showed how the failure to inform Mr. Breard of his right to consular access had no bearing on his trial, conviction and sentence. In our next presentation, Mr. Matheson will analyse yet other relevant circumstances, particularly the implications of this case for other States and for the Court.

3.7. My own discussion will be focused on two interrelated aspects of Paraguay's legal claim. First, I will show how the Court does not have jurisdiction to provide the remedy that Paraguay seeks in its Application. Then I will show how, in assessing whether to indicate provisional measures which may substantially prejudice the party against which they are directed, the Court must weigh the nature of the legal claims before it. The Court should not exercise its exceptional power to indicate provisional measures that prejudice the target State, where the moving Party's claims are legally unfounded or are unlikely to prevail.

3.8. Now as I shall show, particularly given the drastic consequences of Paraguay's basic legal claim — that the lack of consular notification invalidates each and every subsequent conviction of any alien in any State party to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations — that

claim should not prevail. Neither the Convention's language, nor its history, nor State practice supports it.

No Jurisdiction.

3.9. Because of the fundamental flaws that undermine Paraguay's claim for relief, the Court has no jurisdictional basis for the measures now requested. Now admittedly, the showing of jurisdiction at the stage of preliminary measures is less substantial than is required at later stages of the case. As the Court recently summarised in its Application of the Genocide Convention Order

> "[O]n a request for provisional measures, the Court need not, before deciding whether or not to indicate them, finally satisfy itself that it has jurisdiction on the merits of the case, yet it ought not to indicate such measures unless the provisions invoked by the Applicant . . . appear, prima facie, to afford a basis on which jurisdiction of the Court might be established." (*Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Provisional Measures, Order of 8 April 1993, I.C.J. Reports 1993*, p. 11, para. 14.)

Although the burden of showing jurisdiction is lower now than it will be at later stages of this case, the Applicant still has a burden to meet. Paraguay has not met that burden.

3.10. Article I of the Optional Disputes Settlement Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations gives the Court jurisdiction over disputes arising out of the "interpretation or application" of the Convention. However, there is no dispute here about either the interpretation or the application of the Convention. The Parties do not disagree on what it means to "inform" a foreign national of his rights under Article 36, paragraph 1 *(b)*, of the Convention. Nor do they dispute that Mr. Breard was not so informed.

3.11. Instead, Paraguay's claim in this case, in essence, is that under the Vienna Convention the Court can void Mr. Breard's criminal conviction and sentence, and require that he be given a new trial. As I will show, the Vienna Convention does not provide for such an extraordinary form of relief. Paraguay may object to the appropriateness of a criminal conviction and sentence under United States law and practice, but this is not a dispute about the interpretation or application of the Vienna Convention.

3.12. Paraguay tries to meet this difficulty by invoking the doctrine of *restitutio in integrum* (Paraguay's Application, p. 11, para. 25). Paraguay cannot, however, create a right that does not otherwise exist under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations — the Court's sole basis for jurisdiction in this case — simply by invoking a general principle of the law on reparation. Paraguay has failed to make a prima facie showing that the Court has jurisdiction to grant the exceptional relief it seeks here. Under the circumstances, under the Court's well-settled jurisprudence, there is no jurisdictional basis for the Court to indicate provisional measures.

3.13. In this respect, this situation is similar to that faced by the Court in the provisional measures phase of the *Lockerbie* case (case concerning *Questions of Interpretation and Application of the 1971 Montreal Convention arising from the Aerial Incident at Lockerbie, Order, 14 April 1992,* Request for the Indication of Provisional Measures, para. 43) There, the Court found, as a prima facie matter, that there was no legal basis for the Libyan claim under the Montreal Convention because of the adoption of a resolution of the Security Council. The Court therefore rejected Libya's request for provisional measures because "the rights claimed . . . under the Montreal Convention cannot now be regarded as appropriate for protection by the indication of provisional measures". In a similar way here, there is no legal basis for the rights that are claimed by Paraguay. Those claims too are not an appropriate basis for the indication of provisional measures.

The Merits of Paraguay's Claim.

3.14. Obviously, the Court cannot consider the merits at this stage in a case that is 96 hours' old. Nevertheless, in addition to assessing whether it has jurisdiction to proceed, the Court must weigh the totality of circumstances bearing on Paraguay's request for preliminary measures. In so doing, the Court must consider the doubtful nature of the core legal proposition that Paraguay is advancing — that the Convention requires the invalidation of every conviction and sentence of any person who has not received consular notification required by the Convention.

3.15. The difficulties with Paraguay's legal position must be confronted at this stage, and this ought to be an important element in assessing the appropriateness of provisional measures. As Dumbauld wrote at the time of the Permanent Court, "if it is apparent that the applicant cannot succeed in his main action, preliminary relief will of course be denied" (Edward Dumbauld, *Interim Measures of Protection in International Controversies* 165 (1932).

A. Plain Meaning of the Text

3.16. What are the legal difficulties? To begin with, Paraguay's claim conflicts with the plain meaning of the text. Absolutely nothing in the language of Article 36, paragraph 1, of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (or in any other Article of the Convention) offers support for Paraguay's claim that failure of consular notification requires invalidation of any subsequent conviction and sentence of an alien.

3.17. Paraguay's claims follow from Article 36, paragraph 1, of the Vienna Convention, to which both the United States and Paraguay are parties. Article 36 establishes the basic régime for consular assistance to nationals who may be detailed in the receiving State.

Article 36, paragraph 1, provides:

> "1. With a view to facilitating the exercise of consular functions relating to nationals of the sending State:
>
> *(a)* consular officers shall be free to communicate with nationals of the sending State and to have access to them. Nationals of the sending State shall have the same freedom with respect to communication with and access to consular officers of the sending State;
>
> *(b)* if he so requests, the competent authorities of the receiving State shall, without delay, inform the consular post of the sending State if, within its consular district, a national of that State is arrested or committed to prison or to custody pending trial or is detained in any other manner. Any communication addressed to the consular post by the person arrested . . . shall also be forwarded to the said authorities without delay. The said authorities shall inform the person concerned without delay of his rights under this subparagraph."

3.18. Mr. President, as was described by Ms Brown, when the competent federal authorities learned that Mr. Breard may not have been told when he was arrested that Paraguay's consul could

be notified, the United States authorities investigated thoroughly. When they concluded that a violation of Article 36, paragraph 1, probably had occurred, they took action in co-operation with the Commonwealth of Virginia to try to prevent any recurrence. Senior United States officials apologized to Paraguay, and offered further consultations. As Ms Brown just noted, when Paraguay recently proposed that the two sides enter into formal consultations, the United States promptly agreed to that proposal. Unfortunately, however, and notwithstanding Article II of the Optional Disputes Settlement Protocol to the Convention, Paraguay chose to bring its action here instead.

3.19. Thus, there is no legal dispute between the United States and Paraguay regarding the need to give notification as provided for under Article 36, that such notification was not given, and concerning the need to take effective steps to prevent recurrence. The sole issue concerns the consequences under international law if an arrested alien is not told that his consul can be notified. The United States contends that the solution to such a breach of the treaty's requirements is to be pursued through normal processes of diplomatic apology, consultation and improved implementation.

3.20. Paraguay, however, asks this Court to impose much more drastic consequences. Paraguay's Application maintains that the necessary legal consequence for any such breach is that the ensuing conviction and sentence must be put aside. There is absolutely no support for this claim in the language of the Convention. The Court should not read into a clear and nearly universal multilateral instrument such a substantial and potentially disruptive additional obligation that has no support in the language agreed by the parties.

3.21. Mr. President, there are very few situations in which States actually have agreed by treaty that the failure to observe specific standards can be the basis for appeal to an international tribunal for possible reversal of a conviction or sentence. I have in mind here, for example, regional instruments and institutions such as the European Convention on Human Rights and the Strasbourg Court. Where States have elected to create such mechanisms, they have done so

expressly and with great precision. They have not created such additional remedies by indirection or implication, as Paraguay asks the Court do here. Let me return to the negotiating history.

B. Negotiating History

3.22. Likewise, there is no support for Paraguay's claim there. We know of nothing in the history — and Paraguay has pointed to nothing — even hinting that the Parties intended failure to comply with Article 36, paragraph 1, to invalidate subsequent criminal proceedings.

3.23. The Vienna Convention was negotiated on the basis of draft articles prepared by the International Law Commission. The relevant ILC proposals do not contain the obligation to inform an arrested person that their consul could be notified. That was added at the Conference. We have found nothing in the debates of the conference supporting Paraguay's claim, but there are a number of indications to the contrary.

3.24. Article 36 was negotiated with great difficulty at the Vienna Conference. The final version was only agreed upon two days before the Conference ended. Some delegations supported the ILC's initial draft of Article 36, which would have required that receiving States automatically notify sending States' consuls if a national was arrested. A large number of other States strongly opposed this requirement. They argued, among other things, that it would impose an excessive administrative burden on the receiving State and that the national might not want his government authorities to know about his arrest. (Luke T. Lee, *Consular Law and Practice* (1990), pp. 138-139.)

3.25. Ultimately, a compromise had to be reached. The compromise involved a series of amendments to the ILC draft. I will not try to trace all of these for you, but I will mention one because it helps to show that States at the Conference clearly did not intend that failure of consular notification would invalidate subsequent legal proceedings. The negotiations began with the ILC draft providing for consular notification in the case of arrest. That was widely criticized as unreasonably burdensome and impractical. Accordingly, various narrowing amendments were offered by groups of countries.

3.26. One, offered by Egypt and accepted by the Conference, changed the initial language to state that the obligation to inform the sending State only arises if the national so requests. The delegate of Egypt explained his amendment as follows:

> "The purpose of the amendment is to lessen the burden on the authorities of receiving States, especially those which had large numbers of resident aliens or which received many tourists and visitors. *The language proposed in the joint amendment would ensure that the authorities of the receiving State would not be blamed if, owing to the pressure of work or other circumstances, there was a failure to report the arrest of a national of the sending State.*" (Twentieth Plenary Meeting on 20 April, 1963, United Nations Conference on Consular Relations, Official Records, p. 82, at para 62. Emphasis added.)

The explanation of this amendment (which was adopted by the Conference) clearly suggests that the Conference saw the normal processes of diplomatic adjustment as the means to address failure of a notification requirement. The Conference did not foresee that defects of consular notification would result in the invalidation of subsequent criminal proceedings. Had the parties thought so, the many States that already expressed fears about the burden of the notification requirement would surely have voted down the text that is before you today.

3.27. Other statements during the Conference reinforce that the Parties did not intend the Convention to alter the operation of domestic criminal proceedings. The delegate from the USSR stated that "the matters dealt with in Article 36 were connected with the criminal law and procedure of the receiving State, which were outside the scope for the codification of consular law" (*ibid.*, p. 40, para. 3). The delegate from Belarus expressed similar views, noting that "the Conference was drafting a consular convention, not an international penal code, and it had no right to attempt to dictate the penal codes of sovereign States" (*ibid.*, p. 40, para. 8). Such statements directly conflict with Paraguay's claim today. Thus, the negotiating history does not support Paraguay's broad view of the consequences of non-compliance with Article 36, and a variety of statements made during the debate support a contrary view.

C. State Practice

3.28. Likewise, there is no support in state practice for Paraguay's position. As Ms Brown explained, after the Breard case initially came to the attention of the United States federal authorities, the United States Department of State surveyed the practice of the States parties to the Vienna Convention. That survey found no State — none — that adopted the position Paraguay urges on the Court here. Paraguay has referred to no such State practice here.

3.29. The few national court cases that we know have considered the matter have not reached the result urged by Paraguay. Lee's treatise *Consular Law and Practice* cites an Italian case where the Italian authorities failed to provide the required consular notice to Yater, a British national. According to Lee, the challenge to Yater's conviction was rejected.

> "The Supreme Court *(Cassazione)* held that the consular role in assisting the defence of his fellow nationals under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations is of 'a complementary and subsidiary nature, and does not replace the right of the accused to make his own arrangements for his own defence'. Since Yater in this case had adequately defended himself during proceedings through a lawyer chosen by him, the plea was dismissed." (Luke Lee, *Consular Law and Practice* p. 150-151, citing *Cassazione*, 19 Feb. 1973, *re Yater*. Summary and Commentary in 2 *Italian Yb. Int'l L.* 336-9 (1976).)

The issue also has been energetically litigated in United States courts. Indeed, Mr. Donovan, the distinguished counsel for Paraguay, has been a prominent participant in litigation in the United States urging that this approach be adopted as a matter of United States domestic law. However, no United States court has found that the failure of consular notification, standing alone, constitutes a sufficient basis for invalidating a sentence and conviction.

D. No Injury to Mr. Breard

3.30. Finally, as Ms Brown has explained, the notion that Mr. Breard suffered injury because of any failure of consular notification is speculative and unpersuasive. Paraguay's Application asks this Court to indicate provisional measures largely on the basis of some bold assumptions about what Paraguay's consul might have done. In doing so, the Application presents an inflated and unrealistic description of a consul's functions in criminal matters. A consul is not a defence

attorney. Consular protection does not immunize a national from local criminal jurisdiction. What a consul can do is help arrested persons arrange means for their own defence. A consul can notify an arrested person's family, or help to ensure that the defendant has local defence attorneys. A consul does not typically retain lawyers to defend her nationals; the United States does not do so, and Paraguay has not established that it normally does so either.

3.31. But, as we have shown, Mr. Breard was able to accomplish all these things quite effectively without the assistance of Paraguay's counsel without the assistance of Paraguay's consul. He spoke English and had lived in the United States since 1986. After his arrest, he was in regular contact with his family. He was defended by able attorneys throughout his trial and the many subsequent legal proceedings. A consul could not have done more to enhance the effectiveness of Mr. Breard's legal defence.

E. Conclusion

3.32. For all of these reasons — the lack of any textual basis in the Convention, the lack of support in the negotiating history and State practice, and the absence of injury to Mr. Breard — Paraguay's basic claim in these proceedings lacks legal foundation. Because there is no basis for the remedy Paraguay seeks in the Convention, the Court lacks jurisdiction. The weakness of Paraguay's legal claim is also a compelling reason for declining to indicate provisional measures.

III. Provisional Measures and The Rights of the Parties

3.33. Mr. President, my final section, will be relatively brief. I will first address the role of provisional measures in relation to the protection of the rights of the Parties. I will explain why such measures should not be indicated in a form that would create a selective or unjust balance with regard to the Parties. I will then show how, in deciding whether to indicate particular provisional measures, the Court must consider whether those measures improperly prejudge the outcome of the dispute.

3.34. Mr. President, the provisional measures sought by Paraguay amount to a determination on the merits of this case. If the measures sought by Paraguay are indicated and implemented, Paraguay will have won, at least for a period of however many years may be required for the Court to arrive with its final judgment. Paraguay will have advanced its key objective through a hurried and unbalanced proceeding that cannot adequately address the serious legal issues that are at stake.

3.35. This cannot be reconciled with the régime for provisional measures envisioned under Article 41 of the Statute. Article 41 says that the Court may indicate, where circumstances require, "any provisional measures which ought to be taken to preserve the respective rights of either party". Take note: "the respective rights of either party". Provisional measures should not protect the rights of one party, while disregarding the rights of the other. But that is precisely what is requested here. As Paraguay has made clear, its goal here is to prevent the operation of the criminal laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia. It seeks to do so where there is no doubt that the accused committed very grave and violent offences, and where there have already been five years of extensive appellate litigation in national courts. As Mr. Matheson will elaborate in our next presentation, this would significantly impair the rights of the United States to the orderly and conclusive functioning of its criminal justice system.

3.36. Moreover, provisional measures should not be indicated in terms or in circumstances where they constitute a disguised adjudication on the merits. Professor Rosenne makes this point strongly in his remarkable new treatise:

> "The power to indicate provisional measures cannot be invoked if its effect would be to grant to the applicant an interim judgment in favour of all or part of the claim formulated in the document instituting proceedings." (Shabtai Rosenne, *The Law And Practice of the International Court, 1920-1996.* Vol. III, p. 1456.)

Nevertheless, this is precisely what Paraguay seeks. Paraguay is asking this Court for a concealed adjudication on the merits of this case through the guise of provisional measures.

3.37. This is exactly the type of case Judge Oda warned of in his recent essay on provisional measures. As he wrote:

> "In recent cases, the actual matters to be considered during the merits phase have been made the object of the requested provisional measures . . . [T]he applicant States appear to have aimed at obtained interim judgments that would have affirmed their own rights and preshaped the main case." (Oda, "Provisional Measures. The Practice of the International Court of Justice," *in Fifty Years of the International Court of Justice. Essays in Honour of Sir Robert Jennings*, Lowe and Fitzmauice, eds., p. 553.)

3.38. Judge Oda goes on to warns of the implications of this, and of the possibility that:

> "the Court . . . be tempted to deliver an interim judgment under the name of provisional measures . . . If the tendency is to be for the Court to arrive at a quick decision on matters relating to the merits, while reserving for the future other much more judicious consideration on the question of jurisdiction as well as the merits . . ., then the whole matter requires very careful consideration." (*Ibid.*, p. 554.)

3.39. Mr. President, Judge Oda is right to be concerned, this whole matter does require very careful consideration. Provisional measures should not be used as a vehicle for a hasty and legally unjustified decision on the merits of Paraguay's claim. And thus, for all of the reasons I have indicated — because of the lack of jurisdiction, because Paraguay's claim is unsound in law, and because the requested provisional measures are unbalanced and improperly prejudge the merits, the Court should reject Paraguay's request.

3.40. I thank the Court for its attention during a long presentation. I now ask that it invite Mr. Michael Matheson, Principal Deputy Legal Adviser, to present the next section of our argument.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Crook. Mr. Matheson has the floor.

Mr. MATHESON:

4.1. Mr. President, distinguished Members of the Court, it is once again my great honour and privilege to appear before you on behalf of the United States. Mr. Crook has explained the basis for our contention that the provisional measures sought by Paraguay are not within the jurisdiction of the Court and lack any legal foundation. I will now explain the reasons for our view that the granting of the provisional measures sought by Paraguay would be contrary to the interests of the parties to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, the international community as a whole, and the Court as well.

4.2. Article 41 of the Statute of the Court provides in part that the Court "shall have the power to indicate, if it considers that circumstances so require, any provisional measures which ought to be taken . . .". This language clearly indicates that the Court may or may not choose to exercise this power in a particular case, depending on whether it believes the circumstances require it and whether it believes the particular measures proposed ought to be taken. (See, for example, *Aegean Sea Continental Shelf, Interim Protection, Order of 11 September 1976*, separate opinion of President Jiménez de Aréchaga, p. 16.)

4.3. It follows from this that the Court should only grant provisional measures where it is satisfied that this would not only be fair and beneficial to the parties to the immediate dispute, but also would be consistent with the proper role of the Court, the interests of the Parties to the convention in question, and the good of the general international community.

4.4. In the present case, Paraguay has asked the Court to suspend decisions of the criminal courts of a State. To our knowledge, this is the first occasion on which the Court has been asked to do so. In its request for provisional measures, Paraguay has asked the Court, in a matter of a few days, to scrutinize and suspend for an indefinite period the considered decisions of the trial and appellate courts of Virginia and the United States — decisions that have been taken after extensive judicial proceedings over a period of years.

4.5. This would be a very serious step, and one which could threaten serious disruption of the criminal justice systems of the parties to the Vienna Convention, and of the work of this Court as well.

4.6. There are currently over 160 parties to the Vienna Convention, of which over 50 have adhered to the Optional Protocol on Compulsory Settlement of Disputes. The Parties to the Protocol include a number of populous States, such as France, Germany, India, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States, where very large numbers of foreign nationals have immigrated or travelled for various reasons. It is inevitable that a significant number of crimes will occur in any population group of such a size, and in fact this has occurred. It is also to be expected that in

a number of these cases, law enforcement authorities may commit, or be alleged to have committed, errors in the process of consular notification called for under the Vienna Convention.

4.7. The question is not whether such errors should be remedied. Rather, it is whether this should be left to the diplomatic process and to the domestic criminal authorities of the State in question, or whether this Court should assume the role of a supreme court of criminal appeals to deal with such cases by staying, reviewing and reversing domestic court decisions. Once the Court opens itself to this process, it can be expected that a great many defendants will press the States of their nationality to take recourse to it. This would include not only those who received no consular notification at all, but also those who may wish to claim that the notification received was deficient, incomplete, or tardy. It would include not only those who were genuinely prejudiced by the failure of consular notification, but also those who suffered little or no prejudice because they were nonetheless accorded full assistance of competent counsel and all the requirements of due process.

4.8. In principle, if such a remedy were available for violations of the Vienna Convention, why would it not also be available for alleged violations of other conventions when committed against foreign nationals in detention for criminal offenses, such as bilateral treaties with provisions for consular protection, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, or other agreements with provisions concerning rights to be accorded to aliens or to any person accused of criminal offences? If States may ask this Court to stay executions and nullify convictions on the basis of violations of the Vienna Convention, would they not feel able to do so under these other agreements as well?

4.9. It is difficult to believe that the parties to these conventions really intended that this Court serve as a supreme court of criminal appeals in this manner. It is difficult to believe that they intended to subject their domestic criminal proceedings, which typically include both trial proceedings and one or more levels of appellate review, to yet another stage of review by an international tribunal. As Mr. Crook demonstrated, we know this was not the case with respect to

the Vienna Convention. We also know that such a role was not contemplated by the framers of the United Nations Charter and the Statute of the Court.

4.10. Yet this is precisely the message that the Court would give in granting the provisional measures sought by Paraguay in the present case. Delay of the execution of Mr. Breard until the Court's final disposition of the case, as Paraguay requests, would in practice mean the suspension of domestic criminal proceedings for years, whatever the final outcome. Many other defendants in many States could be expected to demand the same treatment, whether the alleged violations were serious or minor, and whether or not those violations led to any significant failures of due process in their conviction.

4.11. In other words, the indefinite stay of execution requested by Paraguay would not be a minor measure that simply preserves the status quo. It would be a major and unprecedented intrusion by the Court into the domestic criminal process that could have far-reaching and serious effects on the administration of justice in many States, and on the role and functioning of the Court.

4.12. All States have compelling interests in the orderly administration and finality of their criminal justice systems, particularly with respect to heinous crimes of the type committed by Mr. Breard. All States have compelling interests in avoiding external judicial intervention that would interfere with the execution of a sentence that has been affirmed following an orderly judicial process meeting all relevant human rights standards.

4.13. We submit that the Court should not take a step having such potentially far-reaching consequences on the basis of a few days of hurried consideration of a suit filed at the very last moment. Before taking any action to intrude into the criminal process of a State, the Court should require Paraguay to show that it does indeed have a basis for its claim in accordance with the normal, orderly process of full proceedings under Part III of the Rules of Court. In this connection, the Court should go through the process called for by Article 63 of the Statute of the Court, which calls for notification of all States parties to the Vienna Convention so as to afford them the

possibility of intervention or other submission of views to protect their own vital interests in the interpretation and application of the Convention.

4.14. Given these compelling reasons for refraining from the provisional measures sought, has Paraguay identified any basis for justifying such an extraordinary remedy? We maintain that this is not the case, since Paraguay has shown nothing to indicate that consular notification would have changed the result of the Breard case.

4.15. Neither Mr. Breard's guilt nor the heinous nature of his crime is at issue; he freely confessed in open court that he had committed the offence. In any case, his guilt was thoroughly established by compelling material evidence. Paraguay has not taken issue with this in its Application or in its argument this morning. There is no question of the execution of an innocent man.

4.16. Nor is there any evidence that Mr. Breard was prejudiced in any way by the apparent lack of consular notification. He had lived in the United States for six years and spoke English well. He understood the proceedings being conducted and participated actively in his own defence. He had full contact with his family and with persons in Paraguay. He had competent counsel well versed in the criminal law of Virginia. He was directly and strongly advised by his attorneys to refrain from the incriminating testimony which he insisted on giving. His conviction was reviewed and upheld by appellate courts of the United States and Virginia.

4.17. Paraguay's contention that the involvement of Paraguayan consular officials would have changed all this is nothing more than imaginative, but wholly unsubstantiated, and implausible speculation. The Court should not engage in an unprecedented intervention in the domestic criminal proceedings of a State on the basis of such implausible speculation. What a domestic appellate court would not do, this Court *a fortiori* should not do. This Court should not serve as a supreme court of criminal appeals in derogation of the normal operation of domestic criminal courts.

4.18. On the other hand, we fully recognize that Paraguay has a legitimate interest in ensuring that the provisions of the Vienna Convention are properly observed and that there is not a

recurrence of the apparent failure of consular notification in the Breard case. Therefore, as Ms Brown described, the United States has taken extensive measures to ensure future compliance by State and local authorities.

4.19. Further, when Paraguay requested bilateral consultations under the Convention, the United States promptly agreed to consultations on all issues raised by the Breard case. We were specifically ready to discuss the possible procedural steps provided for in Articles II and III of the Protocol concerning conciliation and arbitration. However, Paraguay insisted on an immediate stay of execution as a precondition to refraining from immediate recourse to this Court, which the United States was not in a position to grant. The United States nonetheless remains prepared to engage in bilateral consultations aimed at encouraging more effective implementation of this Convention by both Parties.

4.20. Mr. President, for all these reasons, we believe that the granting of provisional measures sought by Paraguay would have serious negative consequences for the Parties to the Vienna Convention, for the Court, and for the international community as a whole. We urge the Court not to take such a step, and certainly not after only a few days to consider the implications of such an action. We therefore encourage and urge the Court to exercise its power to deny the measures requested by Paraguay.

4.21. Once again, I thank the Court for its attention and consideration of these arguments. I now suggest that the Court recognize the Agent of the United States, Mr. Andrews, to conclude the argument of the United States and to present its Final Submission. Thank you Sir.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Matheson. I call on Mr. Andrews, Agent of the United States.

Mr. ANDREWS:

5.1. Mr. President, this morning the Court asked the Government of Paraguay to provide copies of two letters, one dated 10 December 1996 and one dated 3 June 1997. We would be

pleased to provide the unanswered 7 July 1997 letter that the State Department sent to the Government of Paraguay, which was referenced by Ms Brown in her presentation. Mr. President and Members of the Court, this concludes the presentation of the United States. The submission of the United States is as follows: "That the Court reject the request of the Government of Paraguay for the indication of provisional measures of protection, and not to indicate any such measures".

5.2. We thank the Court for its kind attention to our presentations and its consideration of our arguments.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you Mr. Andrews. Both Parties have now concluded the first round of their oral pleadings. The Court will adjourn now and resume at 3.00 p.m. to afford both Parties an opportunity to reflect. The Court stands adjourned until 3.00 p.m.

The Court rose at 12.50 p.m.