land, about 1683, and was the founder of the family in Philadelphia. Dr. Wharton was born in that city March 7, 1820, graduated at Yale in 1839, studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1843. Three years later he was Assistant Attorney-General. He practised fifteen years in Philadelphia, and from 1856 till 1863 was professor of logic and rhetoric in Kenyon College, Ohio. In the last-mentioned year he was ordained in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and became rector of St. Paul's Church in Brookline, Massachusetts, and professor of ecclesiastical and international law in the Cambridge Divinity School, and in Boston. In March, 1885, he was appointed solicitor by Secretary Bayard and examiner of international claims, succeeding the Hon. William H. Trescott, of South Carolina. The degree of D. D. was conferred on him by Kenyon College in 1883, that of LL. D. by the same institution in 1865, and by the University of Edinburgh in 1883. Dr. Wharton began his literary career early in life, and attained eminence as a writer on account of his perspicuous style and scholarly research. With Charles E. Lex he edited the *Episcopal Recorder* in Philadelphia and contributed to periodicals. He edited ten volumes of reports of the decisions of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania from 1835 to 1841, and in 1846 published 'A Treatise on the Criminal Law of the United States.' It comprised three volumes and ran through half-a-dozen editions. From that time until 1887 he published various works on legal and religious subjects, of which the following list is believed by the *New York Times* to be complete: 'The Law of Contracts,' 'Criminal Law,' 'Criminal Pleading and Practice,' 'Criminal Evidence,' 'Precedents of Indictments and Pleas,' 'The Law of Evidence in Civil Issues,' 'The Law of Negligence,' 'The Law of Homicide,' 'Conflict of Laws,' 'Commentary on the Law of Agency and Agents,' 'Medical Jurisprudence,' 'Commentaries on American Law,' 'A Treatise on Theism and Modern Sceptical Theories,' 'The State Trials of the United States during the Administrations of Washington and Adams,' 'The Science of Scripture,' 'Treatise on Private International Law.'

GENERAL NOTES.

MIRTH IN THE SUPREME COURT.—The usual grave demeanor of the United States Supreme Court was upset the other day by the manner in which John S. Wise, of New York city, argued a case of infringement of a patent. One after another the dignified judges relapsed into half-suppressed laughter, and the bar and audience indulged in as much mirth as is ever permissible within the precincts of that august tribunal. The case was an appeal from the United States District Court at Richmond against a manufacturer of men's drawers for infringement of a patent for reinforcement of the seat and crotch. Mr. Wise read the opinion of Judge Hughes of the District Court, and commented on it in a laughable way. Judge Hughes remarked in his opinion: "It strikes me that a patent for a patch for drawers, designed to remedy the evils of rip and tear, to which they are liable in the crotch, ought never to have been granted, interfering as it must necessarily do, with the prerogatives of the housewives of the civilized world to patch the drawers of their husbands, fathers and sons freely in their own way, with no patentee to molest or make them afraid. It seems to me that this patent is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the patent system of the United States. It is impossible that the patch can be novel as to the simple matter of strengthening the seams and the material of the drawers in the immediate region of the crotch; for if drawers do continually give way there, it would be a reflection upon the housewives of civilized society not to admit that for hundreds of years they have been patching garments and the forks thereof, as the patent reads, by lapping the seams and reinforcing the rents in that region. As to the disorder of men's drawers in and near the crotch, which have troubled housewives for centuries, I do not think any person in our day can employ a patch for the purpose of preventing or curing them that can have any real novelty." Counsel for the patentee said the value of the drawers was so increased by being "reinforced" that one pair was equal to two. Mr. Wise, in reply, said that this could not be true, as it was well known everywhere that "two pair beats one," and this was the only game where a "split" counted against a dealer. The evident appreciation of these references to games of cards seemed to imply a guilty knowledge on the part of the learned justices that was as amusing to the bar and spectators as the witticisms of counsel were to the judges themselves.—*Albany Law Journal.*

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.—A story is told about the two eminent ecclesiastical lawyers, Mr. Jeune, Q. C., and Sir Walter Phillimore, Q. C. They appeared recently before the Archbishop's Court on behalf of the bishop of Lincoln, to question the jurisdiction of the court in his case. The archbishop, in full vestments, entered the court, and raising his hands, said: "Let us pray." Mr. Jeune, as became the son of a bishop, at once knelt, but Sir Walter, realising that he was there to take objection to the court, remained standing. When the court was up, Sir Walter upbraided his colleague for his illegal praying. "My dear Phillimore," said Mr. Jeune, "I was praying without prejudice."