say we recognize the mark of a foreign country, this is where the mark is applied by the government, not by the individual manufacturer in the foreign country. The articles are actually assayed and tested by the government departments and the mark is applied by them.

The Chairman: We come to that in section 4, which deals with quality, and the question we have been discussing with regard to the application of those trademarks of other countries which may appear on precious metals and still conform with our standards. Are there any further questions on section 4? Is the section carried?

Hon. Senators: Carried.

The Chairman: Are there any questions on section 5? It seems pretty straight forward. Is this section carried?

Hon. Senators: Carried.

The Chairman: On section 6, we already dealt with that at the beginning, Senator Carter, so I take it we can carry that one.

Hon. Senators: Carried.

**The Chairman:** Then we come to section 7. Sections 7 and 8 refer to the duties and authority of the inspectors in carrying out their job. Are there any questions on those sections?

Senator Kinley: Are there any inspectors now?

The Chairman: There are six.

Senator Kinley: Do they anticipate having more inspectors?

Mr. Lewis: Not at this time, senator.

Senator Kinley: Section 6 says:

The Minister may appoint or designate any person as an inspector for the purposes of this act.

Is not that in the act now?

The Chairman: This is a new act, not an amending bill.

Senator Kinley: Were there inspectors under the old act?

The Chairman: This will repeal the old act. Section 8 defines the duties and so on. Shall these sections carry?

Hon. Senators: Carried.

The Chairman: We come now to section 9 dealing with the regulations. Are there any questions on that? It deals with a recital of the items in respect of which regulations can be enacted and to that extent it is of an administrative character. Shall it carry?

Hon. Senators: Carried.

The Chairman: Section 10 deals with offences and punishment. Any questions?

**Senator Carter:** Are there any differences here from the old act? Are there any new requirements?

Hon. Mr. Basford: The penalty under section 2 used to be \$25 minimum and \$100 maximum. This is changed, as you will see, in the last few words of section 10 to a fine not exceeding \$500.

Senator Benidickson: On this point, we had a discussion about a new format for presentation of bills. We have the French and English in two columns on the left. If there was a change in a bill, say an increase in penalty with regard to an offence, didn't we formerly have on the right hand side of the bill an explanation of the old and new form. What has happened to change this?

**The Chairman:** We had it on all amending bills. But this is a new bill.

**Senator Walker:** Mr. Chairman, under section 10 I see a penalty not exceeding \$500. Supposing they found 10 articles at a time, does that mean \$500 applying to each article if the magistrate so wished?

Hon. Mr. Basford: It would apply to each offence.

**Senator Walker:** So that if there were 10 articles involved it could be \$5,000?

The Chairman: Up to \$5,000.

**Senator Thorvaldson:** Conversely there might be a case where an importer imports, say, a million dollars worth of a certain article which would involve only one effence, and his fine, if found guilty, would be only \$500.

**Mr. Lewis:** I believe each article would be regarded as a separate offence. This is the intent of the legislation, and by removing the minimum fine, if there were a dozen articles involved, you may get a conviction on the dozen offences. Depending upon the circumstances, the court could then impose the fine on one or two and suspend sentence on the