

to have been "established" and thus, that the provisions of the article concerned would not take effect before such time. Thus, at the very least, it will be necessary at the conference to consider carefully the relationship between Article 62 and the other articles referred to above.

There are other articles where problems of a different order exist, susceptible of solution by drafting changes. Articles 16 and 17, for example, dealing with reservations and objections to such reservations are also, in the view of my Government, articles requiring further clarification if they are not to prove a source of future difficulties. In our view, the language of Article 16(c) and related articles on treaties which contain no provisions for reservations, is not sufficiently clear as to whether a reservation, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of a particular treaty, has any legal effect, for example in connection with the coming into force of a multilateral treaty. Further clarification also appears desirable in relation to the problem which would arise in the case of a multilateral treaty, containing no provision *for reservations,* concerning the legal consequences of an objection by one state to a reservation made by another. Is there a treaty relation between the reserving state and the objecting state or does the existence of the treaty relation depend upon the consent of the objecting state.

There are a number of other articles which may be found in the discussions at the Vienna Conference to be a source of substantial difficulties of interpretation or to require further elaboration. I might mention in passing, as an example, Article 5, on Capacity. This Article, as a number of states have pointed out in their comments, appears