

the serious attack on December 18, and this consisted almost wholly of milk. At no time has he had any difficulty with his stomach, and has been able to digest whatever food was given him. Throughout the long illness he has been able to recognize the family and the physicians. While he has not conversed to any great extent, even with the family, for some time past, he has always been able to indicate his wants very clearly. To questions asked him he always replied intelligently, but in monosyllables."

Dr. Johnson said further that there has been no hope of Blaine's recovery since the sinking spell in December, but to within two or three weeks there was strong hope that life might be prolonged. Since then there was no hope and practically nothing was done except to give nourishment.

If the family consents, the physicians will make a statement of the progress of the disease.

A STREAM OF VISITORS.

Following the President's visit, in quick succession came the members of the cabinet. Then one after another in a constant stream, most of the prominent people in official life, called and left words of condolence.

Returning from his visit to the house of death, President Harrison

ISSUED A PROCLAMATION

to the people of the United States announcing the death, giving a brief resume of the public career of the late illustrious statesman, paying tribute to his devotion to public interests, marked ability and exalted patriotism, which have won for him the gratitude and affection of his countrymen, and admiration of the world, and directing that on the day of his funeral, all executive departments at Washington be closed, and on all public buildings throughout the United States the national flag be displayed at half mast, and for a period of thirty days the department of state be draped in mourning.

Secretary Foster issued an order closing the state department.

CLEVELAND HEARS THE NEWS.

NEW YORK, Jan. 27.—President-elect Cleveland, in company with Don M. Dickinson, on their way from Lakewood, N. J., to New York, heard the news of Blaine's death at Elizabethport. He seemed greatly shocked and overcome by the news, and hurriedly inquired for the particulars.

FUNERAL ARRANGEMENTS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 27.—The funeral services are so far decided upon: That services will be held on Monday forenoon and the remains interred here, at least temporarily. It is not yet decided whether the funeral will be public or private.

President Harrison sent for Senator Frye of Maine, to consult about Blaine's funeral, which he thought should be public and at the Capitol. Of course, there has been no opportunity to consult with the family, but Frye had no doubt they would interpose no objection to this honor being paid to the memory of the dead statesman.

LEGISLATURES ADJOURN.

CHICAGO, Jan. 27.—The legislatures of New York, Colorado and Illinois adjourned as a mark of respect. The

Populist house of Kansas passed a resolution of appreciation of his service to the country and sympathy to the family, and the Republican house took recess until four o'clock.

Governor McKinley and ex-Governor Foraker, of Ohio, sent messages of condolence to Mrs. Blaine. Flags in the principal cities are hoisted at half staff.

CAUSE OF DEATH.

The physicians issued the following preliminary announcement of the causes of Blaine's death: Chronic interstitial nephritis (a form of Bright's disease) due to general changes in the arteries and with dilation of the heart. This condition was complicated with disease of the lungs of a tubercular nature. The immediate cause of death was connected with the heart.

Up to a late hour this afternoon the remains of the statesman lay in the front room in the southwest corner of the third floor, where the patient had been uninterruptedly confined since the beginning of the fatal illness. There was no crape on the door and no indication, since the throng of callers had partially ceased, that there had been anything unusual to mar the serenity of the household.

A PLEA FROM PAYSON.

A few reasons for the despair that is in the hearts of the farmers—at least those who have suffered from the depredations of stock and sheep. First: That they destroy thousands of dollars worth of property every year, as completely as if it had been consumed by fire.

Second: That this is the only safe method known of converting, taking by force, without any promise of remuneration, one man's property to the use of another, either with or without intent. Without danger of a criminal prosecution. In regard to the loss that we sustained last fall, I will state: We had a number of acres of lucerne seed near Payson; those owning land next to ours undertook to herd sheep on it, or rather hired a boy to herd. The result was they got on our land while the seed was lying on the ground and threshed out somewhere near one hundred dollars' worth of seed. That is the estimate of disinterested parties. The herder says there were other sheep on the land in question besides theirs. This land had a good fence around it, but the sheep tore the wire off and carried it into the middle of the street. Of course this seed was all destroyed, the sheep getting but little of it. Now all this time we did not know there were any sheep there, this being the first time that sheep had been herded on our farms that I know anything about. It is well known that sheep will go through any kind of a fence except a tight board one five or six feet high. Should we be compelled to put such a fence as this around our land, so that these men can turn their sheep on their own land, either with or without a herder? It makes but little difference which, as was proved beyond a doubt last fall not only in this case but in others that I could name. Does it not look a little more reasonable that they should fence their own land in this way so they could keep them there, and if we

should wish to put sheep on our land that we should do the same? But some will say, "they will have to pay you damages and is not that sufficient?" In answer I will say that we live three miles away, and it is impossible for us to be there all the time and, therefore, not able to swear what sheep did the damage. All that we know is what the herder will admit. Now, this may be a good thing for the sheep man, but how about the farmer? And when we consider that out of this hundred dollars destroyed the sheep owner did not get five dollars benefit, perhaps it makes it much worse than if they had got the full benefit of it. We might say that they burnt up \$95 worth to get \$5 benefit, for that is about the status of it. Now, I would ask is this a profitable way for any people to do business, saying nothing of the right and justice in the case? I will say in behalf of these men that I have no idea but what they thought the sheep could be herded on their own land and might be considered an experiment. As I do not know of any one attempting to herd sheep in the center of our farms before, it seems to me that they will be able to see by this time that it is impossible to do any such thing. There are men, no doubt, with less principle and regard for the rights of others that will continue to do this thing, no matter how much property their animals may destroy, even if they, by utterly destroying ninety-nine dollars of other people's property, could only get one dollar benefit. In this case I do not know what we could do under existing conditions, as it seems to me that this part of the country was made expressly for the benefit of the sheep and stockman, and there would be nothing left for any one else after they had got all they want of it.

It must always be borne in mind in studying this question that the farmers as a rule live in cities and towns from three to four miles away, so that it is utterly impossible for them to know when sheep or stock are on their land, much less know where they are. At the same time, it may be said truthfully that if the sheep owners (or stockmen either for that matter) had to pay for all the damage they do, they would be willing to fence their own land if they put their sheep there.

There is one more illustration I will give to show how this mode of herding sheep might work if persisted in. Some three or four years ago I raised on ten acres of land one hundred and forty bushels of lucerne seed. This brought me in cash about eight hundred dollars. Now, if I had had a neighbor that owned sheep, and he had attempted to herd them on his own land next to mine, it would have been pretty certain that they would have made a threshing floor of my land, and in a very short time, with dogs after them, three-fourths of it at least, or in other words, six hundred dollars' worth of seed would be destroyed, tramped in the ground—burnt up, so to speak. With this mode of herding sheep it is plain that the sheepmen run very little risk of having to pay for the damage they do, because their herder can get them off in a short time, and where people seldom