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EDITORIALS

Freshman Spirit

It seems fitting to comment upon and commend the Freshman for a display of Class Spirit such as has not been evidenced at Kent for some time. On the occasion of the debate between the Senior and Freshman teams for the college championship, a goodly number of the First-Year men and women turned out en masse and actually "rooted" for their representatives. This evidence of class interest might well be emulated by the upper classmen and by the students of the College in general in cases of inter-collegiate as well as inter-class competition, and will go far toward promoting and fostering a fine loyalty to the College.

Common Courtesy

Although it may be all very well to harbour a feeling of undue restraint and to chafe somewhat under the bonds of impatience when an instructor holds the class over-time, yet it seems to us that the dictates of the most elementary courtesy would prohibit thoughtless students from violently slamming books, scuffling their feet, and scraping chairs meaningly when the buzzer announces the close of a class period. The respect due the Professor should prompt the members of a class to permit him at least to conclude the sentence which he has commenced, if not to drive home the point he is trying to make. We should bear in mind, moreover, that the demonstration of that point of law is peculiarly to OUR benefit, not the instructor's.

NOTES ON PRACTICE COURT.

On Wednesday night, November 17, the first directed verdict given this year, was rendered against Chapman and Haskell, in favor of Murray and Jocoby, the defendants. Three of the plaintiff's witnesses had been examined when the court became conscious of the fact that the attorneys for the plaintiff were not presenting their case according to the state of facts given the parties. The Judge explained vociferously that the attorneys for the plaintiff were the first two men in ten years to misinterpret the state of facts in the case, as indicated by the conduct of the case, whereupon Mr. Haskell, associate counsel, in his usual suave and characteristic manner, supported ably by Mr. Chapman, attempted to explain to His Honor, that this was the "modern interpretation" of the case. Upon motion of the defendant at this time, the Court instructed the jury to bring in a verdict for the defendants.

The results in this instance should serve as a lesson to those prosecuting cases in the future in the "Honorable Practice Court." The cases as drawn up are meant to provide at least a passable case for both sides, and it is up to their personal ingenuity to make a weak side a strong one, but no license is given attorneys to vary the facts or mislead the jury by the addition of a multitude of immaterial testimony on a side issue.