

tions so seldom come before us, that I rarely feel it a duty to form and to express an opinion on any subject of a public nature. I cannot consider that the Affirmation Bill involves a religious principle; for, as I had occasion to observe in print more than thirty years ago, what the political and social world means by the word "God" is too often not the Christian God, the Jewish, or the Mahomedan—not a personal God, but an unknown God: as little what Christians mean by God as the fate, or chance, or *anima mundi* of a Greek philosopher. Hence, it as little concerns religion whether Mr. Bradlaugh swears by no God with the Government, or swears by an impersonal, or material, or abstract and ideal something or other, which is all that is secured to us by the Opposition. Neither Mr. Gladstone nor Sir Stafford Northcote excluded from Parliament what religion means by an "atheist." Accordingly it is only half my meaning if I am made to say that "I do not approve, in any sense of the word, of the Affirmation Bill." I neither approve nor disapprove. I express no opinion upon it, and that, first, because I do not commonly enter upon political questions; and next, because, looking at the Bill on its own merits, I think nothing is lost to religion by its passing, and nothing gained by its being rejected.

"I am, dear sir, your faithful servant,

"JOHN H. CARDINAL NEWMAN."

What Cardinal Newman says then, by this drive, is, that he does not enter on the political question, and that from a religious point of view he is neither in favor of the Bill nor against it, because it does not exclude atheists and those who do not believe in a personal God. Not being a theologian, it would be impertinent to say that the Cardinal's view does not accord with the doctrine of the Church of his adoption, or of that in which he was brought up; but certainly in the practice of England and of France, the test has not usually been the belief in a personal God, a Christian God, the Jewish or the Mahomedan God, but belief in responsibility in a future state.

The readers of the *Bystander* will do well, before allowing their minds to be prejudiced by the fallacies of its periods, to consider two things with regard to an Affirmation Bill as a

test for the admission of members to Parliament; first, that all the arguments now used against the test, may with equal force be used against the oath as a sanction for judicial proceedings; second, that the question is a practical one, affecting society, not religion, and that if it be a protection to society, it is no more intolerant to uphold the test than to execute a political assassin who is pleased to justify his crime. R.

#### QUEEN'S COUNSEL.

The following appointments to be Queen's Counsel have been made by the Governor General:—

Ottawa, 26th June, 1883.

#### PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

William W. Robertson, Esquire,	Montreal.
William White,	Sherbrooke.
Hubert C. Cabana,	"
George O. Doak,	Coaticooke,

28th June, 1883.

#### PROVINCE OF ONTARIO.

Valentine MacKenzie, Esquire,	Brantford.
Richard Bayley,	London.
Salter Jehoshaphat Vankoughnet, Esq.,	Toronto.
James Tilt,	"
William Purvis Rochford Street,	London.
George Milnes Macdonnell,	Kingston.
John Bain,	Toronto.
Frederick Drew Barwick,	"
Hugh McKenzie Wilson,	Brantford.
Robert C. Smyth,	"
James Joseph Foy,	Toronto.
Walter Gibson P. Cassells,	"
Norman Fitzherbert Paterson,	Port Perry.
Thomas Horace MacGuire,	Kingston.
Henry J. Scott,	Toronto.

#### NOTES OF CASES.

#### SUPERIOR COURT.

MONTREAL, July 9, 1883.

Before TORRANCE, J.

CAMPBELL, Atty Gen., *pro Regina v. BATE.*

*Patent of Invention—Default to file model.*

*The omission to file a model of an invention for which letters patent are applied for, is fatal to the validity of the patent issued without such model, and without any dispensation by the Commissioner of Patents from filing a model.*

This was the merits of an information by the Attorney-General of Canada, demanding the issue of a writ of *scire facias*, summoning