plicated it might be, if the facts of a case were laid before the jury in the order of their dates, all would become plain sailing. That was the rule. It appears, therefore, that a man who is to succeed at the bar should have a power of dealing with facts in a common-sense business-like way. He should have a quick eye for the strong point in his case, and he should have the well-balanced judgment that will enable him to see the strength of his opponent's position as well as his own. He should see at a glance his own strong point, and should concentrate all his power upon it; and he should recognise the strong point of his opponent, and prepare the jury for it. We commend these very simple rules to the rising generation of barristers; their excellence is vouched for and exemplified by the experience and lofty status of the eminent advocate who has uttered them.—*The Law Journal.*

EASEMENTS OF AIR.—The law of easements has recently been carried further by a decision of Baron Pollock (*Bass* v. *Gregory*), who has decided that there may be an easement by prescription to a current of air in a defined channel. It has long been settled law that there is a distinction between water flowing in streams, whether on the surface or underground, and that which flows in undefined channels percolating through the soil or running over the surface of the land. In the case of a stream, every proprietor on its banks has a right to claim that it shall run on in its accustomed course. No one has a right to stop or divert a stream so as injuriously to affect one who has enjoyed the stream in another part of its course. Further, easements may be acquired over streams, so that by grant or prescription one man may have the right to stop a stream to the damage of another, or to increase the flow of water in a stream: (*Bealey* v. *Shaw*, 6 East, 208; *Carlyon* v. *Lovering*, 1 H. & N., 797). Similarly an easement may be acquired to discharge water over another's land by an artificial water course: (*Hill* v. *Cock*, 26 L.T. Rep. N.S., 185). But in the case of water percolating in undefined channels no such rights are recognized. Although from time immemorial one has had the benefit of such a flow of water from his neighbor's soil, no grant can be presumed; and if the neighbor chooses by sinking a well to put an end to the flow, the damaged party cannot complain. "The presumption of a grant only arises where the person against whom it is to be raised might have prevented the exercise of the subject of the presumed grant; but how could he prevent or stop the percolation of water?" (*Chasemore* v. *Richards*, 8 H.L. Cas., 349). As in the case of water, so in that of air. Air does not commonly flow in defined channels, and it was decided in *Webb* v. *Bird* (13 C.B.N.S., 841) that there cannot be an easement to have a flow of air over one's neighbor's land. Although the plaintiff had for a great number of years had the uninterrupted enjoyment of a free flow of air over his neighbor's land, inasmuch as it would have been practically impossible to prevent such a flow no presumption was raised that he enjoyed it by grant, and so he could not complain when his neighbor built so as to interfere with the free current of air. In the recent case of *Bass* v. *Gregory* (25 Q.B.D., 481), however, a dispute arose about a current of air in a defined underground channel. The plaintiff had a cellar on his land which was