

SINCE the great Chicago fire, more attention has been directed to the subject of fire-proof building. The Washington correspondent of the Cincinnati Commercial recently interviewed Mr. Mullett, the government architect, upon this subject, and here is the reported result—

Mr. Mullett says there are very few fire-proof buildings in the United States. He ought to know, for he has had all the Government buildings in the country on his hands for several years, and has built the best of them, and it is probable he has devoted as much time, study and investigation to the subject as any architect to be found.

"Why, my friend," said he, "don't you know that granite, when subjected to a strong heat, crumbles like dry plaster? It is the best building stone in the world; it will resist time and heat, and damp, and rain, and everything else, but it won't resist fire. Marble is not much better, but it is some; marble will not burn up as soon as granite. Sandstone is about the same, with some few exceptional varieties."

"Now a good many blessed idiots think that if a vault is built of granite it is fire and burglar-proof. Nothing of the sort. If I wanted to make a secure vault I should not make it of granite. A skillful burglar can get into a granite vault in no time."

"How?"

"Why with a blow pipe. With a large blow pipe and a small, sharp blaze well handled, a burglar can crack a block of granite to pieces before you'd know it. When subjected to a severe heat it cracks and splits off in flakes, and you can crush it into sand with your fingers. Oh, no, a granite building is not fire-proof."

"Well, what sort of a building is fire-proof?"

"A granite building," he answered, without apparently noticing the question, "will stand heat a great while, so will marble a great while. But a wooden cupola, or steeple, or tower must not be put on top of it like that on the Chicago court house."

"Granite isn't fire-proof," he continued, "but, as I said before, it will stand a good deal. It is probable the Court house would have stood had it not been for the wooden cupola and the open windows. The Tribune office would probably have stood if it had had iron shutters outside and inside on all the windows. Yet it is by no means certain, if the fire raged with the intensity that is described."

"What, then, is to be done," I asked, "if granite, and marble, and sandstone are not fire-proof? Is not the Capitol, the Treasury, the Patent Office, the Post Office Department—are not they fire-proof?"

"Why, bless your soul, no! Not one of them. But they are probably safe, for all that, because they stand away from other buildings—all except the Postoffice. If we should have such a fire in Washington as that in Chicago I should fear for the Postoffice Building. Why, my dear sir," he continued in a more snappish tone than ever, "do you know there is

#### BUT ONE FIRE-PROOF GOVERNMENT BUILDING IN THE COUNTRY?

That's the Appraisers' stores in Philadelphia."

"Is it possible? And that is the only one?"

"It's the only one I know of."

"What's the material?"

"Why," he answered, "it's brick. Brick is the only absolutely fire-proof building material I know of. They say the Seneca stone is fire proof, and it has stood some wonderful tests, but none of the government buildings have been built of it. Of course granite and marble are good enough, if buildings are apart from others. That's the trouble, Government buildings ought to have big grounds around them. Then there would be no danger. But I have great faith in iron shutters."

Upon a similar subject a Birmingham correspondent of the Boston Journal thus writes—

One familiar with the fearful conflagrations which often occur in America, is impressed with the exemption from fires in England. During a residence of two years in a town of nearly four hundred thousand inhabitants, I have never witnessed the burning of a building and have seen but very few notices of such misfortunes in the papers. They are almost always confined to a single building where the fires occur, so that the term "burned out" is substituted for the American

expression "burned up." Here the walls are usually but slightly injured, and repairs are easily made. The reason for the difference in reference to these calamities is found in the style of building. English houses are almost exclusively built of stone or brick, both in the city and in the country. The plaster is placed upon the walls without laths, and the partitions are of brick. A large proportion of the floors are of tile, (more slate than tile) and the roofs are generally covered with a similar material, instead of the felt and tar so often used in America. Shingles are wholly unknown, and the people do not know the meaning of the word. Many of the churches and buildings are entirely of stone, with the exception of the limited amount of wood required for furnishing, and there is but little combustible material in the structures of the country. Passing through some of the narrow, crooked streets of the old towns, and noticing the ancient and often dilapidated homes of the poor, one can not but think how greatly things would be improved if a sweeping fire could clear away the buildings which have stood for centuries. But the boon of exception is priceless.

And here, from another exchange, is a paragraph upon the French method of building—

The French practice in building is a good one. Instead of using flimsy lath for thin partitions, they employ stout pieces of oak as thick as garden palings. These they nail firmly on each side of the framing of the partition, and fill the space between with rubble and plaster of paris, they coat the whole with the plaster. The floors are managed in the same way, as well as the under side of the stair. Houses are thus rendered almost as near "fire proof" as if built of stone throughout. In Nottingham, England, where they have gypsum in the neighborhood, as in Paris, they form their floors and partitions in the same solid manner; consequently a building is rarely burned down in that populous manufacturing town.

#### THE MORMON OFFENSE.

The law by which Hawkins has been convicted and sentenced was one enacted by polygamists against what they considered adultery to be. It was passed by their Legislature, and signed by Brigham Young himself. If it is construed by the common dictionaries of the country, it condemns polygamy, which these regard as adulterous. If, however, polygamy is to be attacked, why should not the assault be a fair and open and manly one? Are we really driven to the trick of imposing our own construction upon a Mormon law, giving to it a meaning it never had and was never intended to have, and putting it to uses which its enactors notoriously could not have contemplated?

When this people pitched their tents on the borders of the Great Salt Lake, the world felt relieved of them. It was about as if they had gone to the moon. Beyond the great cis montane plains, beyond the Rocky Mountains, and still on beyond the Wasatch range, they disappeared in the almost unexplored regions of the farthest American desert.

They have meanwhile wrought wonders for themselves and the country—have made the wilderness to bud and blossom and the solitary place to sing. They have erected a new and rich commonwealth of Industry beyond Colorado, have joined the civilized world of the Pacific slope with that of the Mississippi valley, have become a hundred thousand in population and created over seventy millions of wealth.

Polygamy nevertheless is not to be acquiesced in; yet we should attack it with our eyes open. There should be first taken an inventory of the facts. If we enter upon a relentless crusade against that people, to the extent that they are involved in this wrong, what sort of success shall we have? Will they not be compelled to resistance? What are their powers for mischief? Will polygamy yield only to so disastrous an onset?

Vigorous prosecutions to break down this system are needless. They would but evoke retaliation, which might even grow to a destruction of the Utah settlements, and their abandonment for New Mexico, leaving Utah the desert that it was a quarter of a century ago. An extensive portion of the railroad to the Pacific could be destroyed, and Indian and Mormon hostilities might be inaugurated that would cost the government many tens of millions, besides in-

definitely interrupting the settlement of the Far West. For all this there would be no appreciable compensation in the improved or preserved virtue of any man, woman or child. The expelled people would but cherish polygamy more than ever.

We therefore object to anything like a vindictive crusade against the Mormons. The offenses committed under practically dead laws in times past should remain unnoticed. There is little difference in effect between the passage of a law *ex post facto* and the revival of a law long permitted to lie dead on the statute-book. Justice therefore joins with wise statesmanship in dictating that the Mormon offense should be dealt with in the judicious manner we have indicated.—Missouri Democrat.

#### THE EPOCH OF PUBLIC SCOURGE.

Never, perhaps, before in the history of the world, have so many terrible calamities happened within a short period of time, as during the last six weeks. The tremendous conflagration in Chicago, which destroyed over \$300,000,000 worth of property, and made over 100,000 persons homeless; the Michigan and Wisconsin fires, which burned farms, villages and towns, with their inhabitants; the destruction of the American whale fleet by icebergs; the late extraordinary tide in Boston and severe gale in the East, causing a severe loss; the terrible earthquakes in Chile and Peru, completely destroying the towns of Pica and Matilla; the cholera in Constantinople and other parts of Europe, which is rapidly spreading and has already touched this continent; the famine in Persia, that has decimated the people and drives the famishing crowd every morning to the residence of the English Embassy, crying for food; the flood in China whereby 1,000 people were drowned in Newchwang alone; the small-pox in the west coast of Africa, whereby the people are dying at the rate of twenty per cent. Are they not a terrible array of calamities within a short time? Yet the summary is incomplete. This fall (has really been the harvest time of death—the epoch of public scourge.—Alta Cal.

#### LET HIM BE PUT UPON TRIAL.

Polygamy is not *en regle*. Its practice does not accord with the civilization of the age. Polygamy and radicalism are twin relics of barbarism. The first mentioned twin, very singularly, is a good deal older than its brother. Polygamy was practiced by the Patriarchs, and, according to the modern idea, was an entirely inexcusable practice, especially among patriarchs. We don't believe that even a young man has need of two or more wives; at any rate the world has more than maintained its quota of population, and secured a fair share of rational happiness to men and women without its practice. We agree with the sentiment of the age that polygamy is condemned by Christianity, and is inconsistent with an advanced order of civilization. We do not desire that it shall be practiced in Utah, or that Theodore Tilton's method of marriage on trial shall be adopted there or anywhere else. This condemnation of polygamy and the whole brood of kindred vices we desire to make as explicit as our command of plain English will enable us to do.

When we have said thus much we feel at liberty to add that there is something else to be done in the preservation of a high grade of civilization besides rooting out the Latter-day Saints. The administration of justice in accordance with the forms of law is equally essential to the preservation of the country, with the destruction of polygamy. Hence, when a Saint of the Utah stripe is put upon his trial for being too much wived, we don't believe that Mr. Justice McKean, sitting as a court, and under the obligation of an oath to be a just and impartial judge, should put himself in the place of the prosecutor and harangue the jury into a conviction by answering in hustings style the arguments of the defendant's counsel. That is precisely what Mr. Justice McKean, of Utah, has done, unless he is greatly belied. In his ambition to be the leading crusader against an admitted wrong, he commits a crime so great as to dwarf the dimensions of the social evil he wars against. The judicial ermine should be spotless; the judge on the bench should hold the scales of justice as evenly as the bronze impersonations of the Goddess of Justice. The power for good of all the machinery for the administration of law is lost when the judge allows himself to become the partizan of either side. McKean is accused of this, and his crime appears patent to the eyes of the world. Let him be put on trial before the great bar of public opinion, and may he receive that impartial justice which he denies to others.—Pueblo (Colorado) People.

WHITHER BOUND?—The Cleveland (O.) "Herald" thinks that the "Mormons" are not unlikely to enter upon another exodus,

and that there is no more likely place for their destination than the Navigator Islands. Well, the "Mormons" are not gone yet.

#### THE POLYGAMY PROBLEM.

We have received and published several letters from Salt Lake, combatting our views on the action of Judge McKean respecting the Hawkins case. All our correspondents admit that if our view is right, then McKean is wrong, but they undertake to dispute the accuracy of our position. We are not apologists for polygamy in any sense, but we are staunch sticklers for justice, and we have held that in the Hawkins case justice was not administered. We see no reason to alter our opinion in that regard, nor does the reference to Justice Marshall at all weaken our convictions. Nothing can be more certain than that in framing a law providing penalties for adultery, the Mormons did not intend to prohibit or to punish polygamy. It is not even pretended that any such intent existed, but a parcel of shallow-pated fellows and prejudiced scribblers (we do not allude to our own correspondents) appear to think that the United States Government has done a very smart thing in turning the table upon the Saints. We cannot join in this opinion. To us it appears that the honor and dignity of the Federal Government have been dragged in the dirt by Judge McKean, who has disgraced the Administration by saddling it with an action worthy only of some small, conscienceless peddler. It was the duty of the Government to attack polygamy, but it should have been done in a manly and equitable fashion. This pettifogging way of splitting straws and balancing motives is more befitting some little shyster-ridden Justice's Court, than the great machinery of the Federal Government, and we, speaking in behalf of every clear-sighted and honest man in the country, denounce and reprove it as an insult and a reproach to the American people.—Sacramento Record.

BAD WORK.—The Davenport Democrat thus describes the Grosvener homicide—"A government rifle, with a fool at one end and a dead citizen at the other."

TO BE PERSECUTED.—The Shipton-Mallet (Eng.) Journal says sarcastically—

"The Mormons are to be persecuted. In a State that boasts of its religious equality, those who hold, as a matter of conscience, certain opinions are to be put down."

If the United States permits such inconsistency, the country will be despised by all real lovers of religious liberty everywhere.

ANOTHER SOLUTION.—Bishop Tuttle according to the New York Standard asserts that the completion of the Northern Pacific Railroad will do more than anything else to put down "Mormonism," by encouraging emigration. The Montana New North-West falls "to see the connection." Never mind, put the railroad through, whether "Mormonism" is thereby put down or not. If any help is wanted to build the road, send to Salt Lake. People here have got the railroad building spirit.

NO UTAH IN THE MESSAGE.—It is intimated that the President will make no recommendation in his forthcoming message with regard to Utah. He will simply set forth what has been done by the United States Judiciary, and then leave the whole question open for Congressional action. Large numbers of people are here now, in the interest of the Mormons, and also opposed to them, who are endeavoring to force the President to take some decided step in regard to Utah.—Washington Correspondence St. Louis Democrat.

BRIGHAM YOUNG ON STEEL.—We wish to inform the brethren hereabouts that we have just received from Mr. O. R. Savage, a very capable photographic artist of Salt Lake, a splendid steel engraving of Brigham Young, which now occupies a conspicuous place on the sanctified walls of the inner sanctum of the Herald. Mr. Savage could not possibly have paid us a greater compliment. The picture is remarkably life-like and accurate of the extraordinary man who has ruled so long and well over the people of Utah, and is much prized by us for that reason.

Neighboring editors of the radical persuasion can have the privilege of making Brigham Young's acquaintance through this "counterfeit presentment" by taking off their hats in its presence, but upon no other condition.—Omaha Herald.

DISTINGUISHED MORMON.—Bishop Hunter arrived in the city yesterday from Salt Lake, and is stopping over a day or two for rest, as also to visit his nephews, Messrs. M. D. and Wm. Hunter, of this city, whom he has not seen for a score and a half of years. He is an aged man, and one of the early professors of the Mormon faith; went into the Utah Valley with the rest in 1847, and with a single exception has not recrossed the plains since. He took the first gold to the U. S. Mint that was taken out in that region, more than twenty years ago; is reputed to be a man of wealth and high ability. He has rooms at the Burtis House—leaves for the East tomorrow.—Davenport (Iowa) Democrat, Nov. 21.