declaration of policy" and not a reservation, the Sixth Committee, and subsequently the General Assembly, approved almost unanimously a resolution expressing the hope that in the light of India's statement an appropriate solution to regularize "the position of India may be reached in IMCO at an early date". Canada was a co-sponsor of this resolution, which the Representative of India considered as "a very good example of international conciliation and co-operation".

Independently of the question of India's participation in IMCO, the General Assembly was also requested on the same occasion to "pronounce itself clearly on the principle and procedure to be followed" in the matter of reservations in general[5]. However, it soon became clear in the course of the debate, that no general agreement could be reached on a uniform rule which would make it possible for the Secretary-General to discharge his functions as depositary without the present uncertainties. The majority felt, indeed, that it was not prepared to take a hasty decision on such a complex problem. The following compromise resolution emerged after a protracted debate:

> "*The General Assembly,*
>
> *Recalling* its resolution 598 (VI), Reservations to multilateral Conventions,
>
> 1. *Decides* to amend paragraph 3(*b*) of resolution 598 (VI) by requesting the Secretary-General to apply to his depositary practice, until such time as the General Assembly may give further instructions, the aforesaid paragraph 3(*b*) in respect of all conventions concluded under the auspices of the United Nations and which do not contain provisions to the contrary;
>
> 2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to obtain information from all depositary States and international organizations with respect to depositary practice in relation to reservations, and to prepare a summary of such practices including his own for use by the International Law Commission in preparing its reports on the law of treaties and by the General Assembly in considering these reports."

This resolution constitutes merely an interim administrative solution of the problem; however, on the other hand, while leaving the basic issue unresolved, it will not have the effect of inhibiting the positions which countries may wish to take in the future on the substantive problem of reservations. Thus Canada would be quite free to re-introduce in its original version or in an amended form the majority formula advanced by its delegation at the close of the 1952 debate[6]. As pointed out by the Canadian Representative, this year's debate has once again given evidence of the increasing importance for negotiators of all future United Nations multilateral agreements to consider the insertion therein of specific provisions relating to the admissibility or non-admissibility of reservations and to the effect to be attributed to them[7].

Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities

Work on the codification and development of the international law governing diplomatic intercourse and immunities was begun by the International Law Commission in 1954. The Commission completed its study in 1958 and submitted a final draft of 45 articles to the thirteenth session of

---

[5] See Document A/4188 of August 17, 1959.

[6] See *"Canada and the United Nations, 1951-52"*, p. 131.

[7] As was recommended in 1952 in paragraph 1 of General Assembly resolution 598 (VI).