FRANCE says this Article would be superfluous if members would adhere to this Convention. CZECHOSLOVAKIA, NETHERLANDS and BELGIUM-LUXEMBOURG and UNITED KINGDOM suggests that the Article be reviewed in the light of the Convention of 1923. BRAZIL agrees that customs formalities should be simplified and limited whenever possible. BRAZIL and INDIA agree that customs formalities should not be used as an additional protection to domestic products.

Paragraph 1, First Sentence
NETHERLANDS and BELGIUM-LUXEMBOURG propose that a definite date be fixed for implementing the measures referred to in this sentence.

Paragraph 2
AUSTRALIA suggests that the obligation to review customs law and regulations should arise only on specific requests of another member for review of a particular law or laws.

Paragraph 3
1. Both FRANCE, NETHERLANDS and BELGIUM-LUXEMBOURG draw attention to the undesirability of appearing to interfere with the independence of judges by specifying that only nominal penalties
may be imposed. Therefore, the NETHERLANDS and BELGIUM-
LUXEMBOURG propose that the paragraph 3 be cancelled and revised,
and included as a recommendation for the customs administrations in
the protocol.

2. The NETHERLANDS and BELGIUM-LUXEMBOURG feel that nominal
penalties would be appropriate only for obvious and accidental
errors but not for serious cases of negligence, even although
there is no evidence or bad faith.

3. SOUTH AFRICA. In the endeavour to eliminate bad practices by
customs administrations, care should be taken to avoid extreme
measures indicated by paragraph 3.

4. NETHERLANDS and BELGIUM-LUXEMBOURG. The expression "product
of any member country" should be clarified as previously mentioned
in remarks in Article 9.