

It is an unpleasant task to draw attention to the meaner qualities of men, while it is an agreeable duty to commend their nobler tendencies or deeds. Be that as it may, while we never precipitate the initiatory attack, those who make unjust assaults and sacrifice truth for the attainment of ulterior ends may expect us to follow them up as long as we can wield a Faber in defense of the right.

THAT GRAZING LANDS DECISION.

A CORRESPONDENT writing from Littleton, Morgan County, propounds the following inquiries respecting the scope of the decision in the case of Buford et al. vs. Houtz, et al., lately rendered in the Supreme Court of the United States:

"Various opinions being entertained over the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the matter of stock running on railroad lands purchased by private parties, we would like some information on the subject. In times past parties from other counties have driven their stock and sheep on our range and almost to our very doors, until our range was overstocked and destroyed.

"Our people in this place have contracted with the Union Pacific railroad for four sections of railroad lands, and at a sacrifice have made the first payment. Now those same parties, with others, say that under the recent decision they can drive and pasture their stock on our land, and we cannot sue for trespass, but that we must fence our lands to receive the benefit of our purchase. The information we desire is—can those parties or others do this, or to what extent can they drive or pasture on those lands before they are committing a trespass? Have the people who have contracted for the purchase of those lands more rights in pasturing stock on those same lands than strangers?

"Again, we have a no fence law. If the people should cultivate any part or portion of said land by sowing various kinds of grass seeds, could stock be taken up for trespass if there were no fence around it? These are matters of interest to many."

It will be remembered that the plaintiffs were the purchasers of a large number of sections of C. P. railroad land, and that the defendants were sheep owners. The action was brought to prevent the latter from driving their sheep over the lands belonging to the plaintiffs in order to pass from one section of government land to another. The case was first decided by Judge Zane, whose decision, we understand, is affirmed throughout.

The effects of the decision, as we understand it, are as follows: Private parties who have purchased or leased from railroad companies the sections of land which alternate with government sections must fence their claims, in order to have a right of action for trespass when

the stock of other parties are driven over them. In fencing the private sections of land, a right of way must be left open that will admit of stock being driven from one government section to another. If private sections are not fenced, stock may be driven over them and may graze to a reasonable extent in passing, but may not be herded upon them.

It should be remembered that this applies only to *uncultivated grazing lands*, and not to lands upon which any kind of seed or crops have been sown. If the sections referred to by our correspondent are included in a precinct in which a no fence law prevails, such portions of them as have been sown to any kind of a crop come under the operations of the no fence law, and damages may be recovered for trespass upon the cultivated portions. But such parts of the sections referred to by our correspondent as still remain uncultivated grazing lands do not come under the operations of the local no fence law, but under the rules laid down in the decision here referred to.

LETTER FROM EGYPT.

On the narrow strip of land that separates the Mediterranean from the two meters lower lake Marcotis is situated Alexandria, the chief seaport, and the next greatest city of the land of the ancient Pharaohs. In its present aspects none of the Pharaohs would be able to recognize it were they to leave their mummies and visit it with other tourists, so completely changed is it from what it formerly was, but, contrary to many of the renowned cities of the Orient, changed for the better.

The inhabitants of Alexandria are estimated at 230,000, of whom not less than 50,000 are foreigners, French, Italians and Greeks. The trade is almost exclusively in the hands of the Greeks, and I have heard it said that even where a Jew would be at a loss to make a living, a Greek is sure to grow rich. That the trade of this place is considerable can be concluded from the number of vessels that constantly fill the harbor and daily pass out and in. In 1884 the imports amounted to the value of 708 millions of piasters against an export of 1233 millions. The articles of export are chiefly cotton, cotton seed, cereals and sugar.

Monumental buildings of excellent (international) architecture, statues, coffee-houses (French style), gas lights, waterpipes, and theatres—these give to Alexandria an air of the Occident, strong and pleasant enough, after all, to make one forget that one is still in the Orient.

The foundation of Alexandria is due to Alexander the Great, from

whom the city has its name. According to tradition, this monarch had a dream. An old man appeared and cited to him the following verse from Homer: "One of the islands lies in the far-reaching current. Before the river Ægyptos, and Pharus, so is it named." (Od. iv: 54-55.) Acting on the inspiration of this dream, he founded opposite the island, close by the Egyptian village Rakoti, a new fortified city. This was in the year 331 B.C. Into the hands of one Dinocrates the work was given. The situation is excellent. The currents of the sea, which carry away vast quantities of the evacuations of the Nile, filling the bays of Syria and destroying the harbors, leave Alexandria untouched, and she has, therefore, a great advantage as a maritime point. Ptolemaeus Soter, or perhaps his son, Ptolemaeus Philadelphus, conceived the idea of connecting the island of Pharos with the main land by a kind of bridge, the so-called Heptastadium. The harbor was thereby divided in two, as it is today—Port Neuf and Port Vieux. But where was originally only a narrow connecting link between the island and the main land there is now a 1500 metres wide strip of land, made up from ruins of the ancient city, on the top of which the Turkish portion of the present city has been built. On the eastern extremity of the island once stood that great lighthouse, 180 metres high, which was counted among the seven wonders of the ancient world, and from which the name "Pharos" has been transferred to modern structures erected for similar purposes.

Alexandria, like the whole Orient, has a history, some pages of which are very stormy, indeed. When Alexander was dead, his general, Ptolemaeus Lagi, became the ruler of Egypt and made the young city his capital. During his reign, and also during his immediate successor's, Alexandria flourished and became the most important city in the world, the centrum of commerce and Greek learning. But contentions about the throne followed. The Romans found cause to interfere. Julius Cæsar took the city, but the people besieged him, and sanguine struggles ensued, during which the library of the museum was destroyed by fire. Antonius, who had won the heart of Cleopatra (after Cæsar), and who led a voluptuous life in the beautiful city for years, tried to heal up the wounds of the wars and brought a new collection of books into the destroyed library. Alexandria, however, became from this time the scene of repeated insurrections. There were many Jews residing there, and these—as if anxious to hasten their own destruction—constantly caused some disturbance or other. The Emperor Hadrian, some 120 years A. D., complains about them in a letter to Servian, that the Alexandrines were an enterprising, but disloyal, rebellious, good-for nothing set. Caracalla, 211 A. D., took a fearful revenge for some attempted rebellion. He killed a great number of the inhabitants and destroyed their public buildings.