

in each case there has doubtless been hesitation and difference of opinion within the Government, and in each case the policy of conciliation has been worsted, the policy of repression has prevailed. Thus it is notorious that the Crimes Bill was introduced after much hesitation. Then Lord Hartington expressed his disapproval of the principal action taken under it, the proclamation of the League. It may well be believed that voices were raised for the immediate prosecution of a large measure of land purchase, and for the application to Ireland of the Local Government Bill. Yet, as the Home-Rulers say, it is the necessary fate of the Government policy to shed any liberal element which it contained; that it is a policy which hath not a genuine liberal element, and therefore that there should be taken from it that which it seemeth to have. The path they have entered upon leads further and further away from remedial measures and from free government.

Mr. Gladstone, in his letter to Lord Edward Fitzmaurice, expresses the regret which was widely felt, especially at first, in the Liberal ranks, that they have been forsaken by the Liberal aristocracy and the leisured class who used to be accepted as the natural leaders of the party. This is said with reference to the sound principles which, during a hundred years or more, guided the Irish policy of the Whig leaders. But the Whig party was an aristocratic party, and, before the home-rule controversy arose, it was something more than moribund from the same causes among others which enable Liberals to face the defection of the aristocracy without any discouragement. The political influence of the aristocracy is very small compared to what it was sixty years ago. That is in large measure due to the relative diminution of their political power by the enfranchisement of the masses. But it is also due to the dilution of the aristocracy of birth by an aristocracy of wealth. When almost all the social advantages which birth used to confer can be purchased with hard money, the possession of a high social position does not, as it used more or less to do, imply the performance or memory of public services, the generous presumption of inherited worth, or any other quality which takes hold of the public imagination. As to the leisured classes, as distinguished from the aristocracy, it is true that a very large proportion of them have held aloof from the home-rule movement, whatever explanation may be given of the fact. The maintenance of the Act of Union was a fixed idea with them, in a way which it was not with the mass of the electors. It appealed to their conservative instincts, which somewhere influence every class, and the influence of the idea was naturally great, if, as is probable, the majority were very slenderly informed on the facts of Irish history. Another element was the opinion that, in the Parliament of 1880, the Irish National party praised with faint condemnation the perpetration of crime in Ireland.

But while the absence of the moneyed and professional classes means undoubtedly the withdrawal of a check on democratic progress, I do not think the main stream of liberal opinion among the mass of the electors has shown any tendency, as some feared, to abandon itself to the guidance of half-educated, fanatic, unscrupulous, or incompetent leaders. Leaders of the old stamp are not wanting, in spite of all defections, but what is more important is, that the extension of the franchise and the duty of deciding the present great controversy have found the electors ripe for the responsibility laid upon them. Newspapers are eagerly read, political questions are discussed with intelli-

gence, fairness, and self-restraint, and, saving the exceptions which have always existed, and are always to be expected, there is no tendency to put public affairs into bad hands. Leaders may in time come from the masses as well as from the classes. There is no reason why we should not have our Lincolns and our Garfields.

Lord Hartington said lately that the home-rule question promised to be the dividing line between parties in the future. It does seem so, until the question is settled, and, following Lord Randolph Churchill's example, in order to reconcile professing Liberals to the situation, he pointed out that they were more likely to obtain Liberal reforms from the present Government than from a leader who acknowledged that he must first get the Irish question out of the way. It is a fair political argument, though, when applied by Mr. Gladstone to Disestablishment, it was denounced as bribery. But Lord Hartington was honest enough to let his hearers know some of the expurgations which might be expected in a Tory edition of Mr. Gladstone's Nottingham programme. He spoke coldly of "one man one vote," a very mild example of a resolve to carry out the Liberal principles of the franchise to their logical consequences; also of the limitation of the power of settlement of land to lives in being, an elementary principle of land reform. Lord Randolph Churchill had already discarded Disestablishment, which no doubt will now remain a plank in the Liberal platform, beginning with Scotland and Wales. Then at Oxford Lord Salisbury made more important reservations as to the value of the principle of representation and election in local government. Accordingly, the dissentients still supposed to be ardent Liberals may have rather meagre fare. If the representative principle is seriously violated in the Local Government Bill, that, coupled with the denial of the reforms to Ireland, will have an immediate and far-reaching effect.

But at the Oxford conference, the effect of the profession, "We are as liberal as you," was, in the absence of responsible leaders, marred by a resolution passed in favor of protection; and it is rudely surmised that the rank and file, the strength and heart of the Tory party, care more for an ounce of protection than for tons of Nottingham reforms, however much or little of them they may be willing to swallow with as much dilution as possible. Protection dies very hard, and it is natural that it should. Never, since the repeal of the Corn Laws, has so deadly a blow been given to it in this country as your President's message, which has been received by Free-Traders with extraordinary interest and hopefulness. Not that free trade is in real danger in this country, or that the President's message is misunderstood to involve an adoption of the theory of free trade, but protection, now generally under some *alias*, such as "fair trade" or reciprocity, always crops up here in bad commercial times. In spite of the tempting bait of high wages, the workingmen compare the cost of living with what they remember or have been told of forty years ago. They treat the issue as a simple ruse, and are rarely deluded. To manufacturers, life-long Liberals, in the present state of foreign tariffs, the question is often a sore stumbling-block and temptation. In 1885 many elections were fought entirely on that issue, and, apart from Ireland, the Liberals won. Then the commission on the depression of trade was issued, and, despite its constitution, the report of the great majority, the preponderance in numbers and weight as well as the evidence, gave no countenance to protection. Yet the ghost was not laid. Manufacturers, orthodox in

the Liberal faith, but suffering in pocket from bounties and hostile tariff, spoke uneasily on the subject. This the genuine Tories knew. The theoretical arguments seemed to escape the grasp of a plain man who was suffering, and foreign countries would not acknowledge the evils which theorists said were produced. Now that they are acknowledged and exposed in the weighty language of the President of the United States, the effect will be to extinguish the attempt to revive the heresy in this country.

C. D.

#### PALLADIO AT VICENZA.

ALASSIO, November 17, 1887.

THE so-called "Gothic Revival" worked, in its day, much good in more ways than one, but it had the "defects of its qualities," as the French say. Its leaders, with all the zeal of apostles, had also the true apostolic narrowness and intolerance. For instance, we find it hard at this moment to forgive the late George Edmund Street for having kept us many years away from Vicenza. In his book on north Italy he deals out a contemptuous injustice to Palladio, which, in days when we believed in him, in Mr. Ruskin, and their likes, made a great impression on us—all the greater as we had no knowledge whatever of Palladio, and, consequently, despising him was a natural proof of our adhesion to the Gothic cause.

You know there is no friend that sticks so closely as a prejudice. This one had survived our veneration for the coryphe of the revived Gothic chorus—it had not had so many occasions of being questioned. It had hindered us from seeing the few works of Palladio that we had come across. We had passed Vicenza over and over again, and, though the aspect of the place, as seen from the rail, had tempted us, we had until now held out against its charms.

"Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis," and so it happened that we found ourselves in Vicenza lately, with quite another baggage of notions and sympathies from that we should have carried there twenty years ago. One among the many causes that had contributed to the change in us was the passage in Goethe's 'Italienische Reise' describing his visit to Vicenza. He said that no copy or engraving of the works of Palladio had ever given him any idea of the beauty of them, and his enthusiasm over them led him to make all haste to buy a copy of the great architect's writings. For Goethe recognized in him an intrinsically great man, whose greatness worked outwards from within. ("Er ist ein recht innerlich und von innen heraus grosser Mensch gewesen.") We know that in matters of art the admirations of this century are far from coinciding with those of the eighteenth, but somehow this appreciation of Goethe's made its impression.

Every one who has gone from Verona to Venice has had a chance to see the beauty of Vicenza from the outside. From Verona eastward the mountains towards the north approach the line of the rail; later the mountains of Berici rise close on the south, and the broad plain we have traversed from Milan seems to contract to a defile. The rich confusion of a land teeming with corn and wine, dotted with villages, with graceful *campanili*, with villas or mediæval castles, is nowhere more striking than here. It is in the midst of this landscape that Vicenza, bedded in foliage, lifts its towers. Its charm no doubt makes itself felt by many a traveller, but Italy has so many interesting cities that few find time to see them all, and Vicenza is sacrificed to Verona and Venice.

The first view inside the gate reveals a series of perspectives of the crumbly architecture dear

to the heart of Prout and the water-colorists of his day. If there be any artist at present capable of rendering that sort of thing, we would counsel him to try Vicenza. He will find there "motives" enough to fill his portfolio. Even the narrowness of Mr. Street was obliged to confess that the city is very picturesque, though he thinks it is "in spite of Palladio and Scamozzi." There are some beautiful Gothic houses of the Venetian type, but it is not they that give the character to the place. Palladio was the great man of Vicenza, and an exception to the rule that refuses to a prophet honor in his own country. The town everywhere bears the impress of his genius. It is full of palaces (the President De Brosses, indeed, recalls a tradition that Palladio, in revenge for some slight shown him, excited in his townsmen the mania of splendid building in order to ruin them), and these palaces were either designed by the one prolific brain or by others of his school. Everything that was not built by Palladio himself has been so modelled on his style that it is by no means always easy to distinguish the work of the disciples from that of the master. Both Baedeker and Gsell-Fels, in fact, ascribe to him one fragment, the so-called *Ca del Diavolo*, that was built by Scamozzi—Scamozzi, who in Venice, in the *Procuratie Nuove*, imitated Sansovino, and rendered like homage in Vicenza to Palladio, hating him the while with all the fervor of an imitator.

Vicenza is, then, the monument of one man, who has done more than any other to fix the types of architecture, domestic and civil, from his day to our own. All sorts of styles come into and go out of fashion, and the world still comes back, especially when it is a question of any important building, to the adaptation of Roman forms perfected by Palladio. It has its defects, there is no denying that; but in an age when there are no great geniuses occupied with architecture, it secures results more satisfactory than are to be reached by any other style. Mr. Symonds, in his '*Renaissance in Italy*,' somewhere said that it would be impossible in England to model a building after the Certosa at Pavia, with its façade covered with delicate sculptures, but that a reasonable degree of success might crown the work of an architect who contented himself with the Palladian qualities of correct proportion, symmetry, simple and conventional ornament. We trust that Mr. Symonds takes some brains and good sense for granted in his architect, as otherwise the effects of his effort may be disastrous. There is, for example, at Vicenza a villa which has so excited the admiration of the world that it has been reproduced in England at least four or five times. Now, a main feature in Palladio's design is a great portico that is repeated on the four sides of the house, a feature reproduced faithfully in all the copies. But the Vicenza villa crowns a knoll, is freely approached from all sides, and commands in every direction a beautiful view. Palladio said it was in order to take advantage of this situation that he quadrupled the portico in his plan; he, moreover, managed the orientation so that his employer could enjoy the outlook without being exposed to any one of the prevailing winds. These are, however, considerations that his English and other imitators have utterly ignored, and so the design, transferred to unsuitable positions, and made to serve wants it was never intended to supply, becomes an absurdity.

It must be owned that the path of the modern, especially the northern, architect who would follow Palladio is beset with thorns, at least in domestic architecture, where the requirements of those who employ the builder are so different from what they were in the sixteenth century.

To this day Italians are very careless of what we call comfort, and have but primitive notions of convenience. But they still admire a *bella ordinazione*, they are still fanatics of symmetry, they still are affected by what is noble, stately, adapted to dignified representation. So when Palladio had combined a certain number of big rooms and little rooms, staircases, saloons, corridors, ante-chambers, on one side of a line, he had only to repeat them in reverse order on the other side to satisfy all the wants of his employers in respect of arrangement. Their life seems to have fitted easily into any combination of rooms which they found beautiful. The internal disposition of a modern great house is much more complex, and the effort to mask it with a symmetrical Palladian façade is often fruitful in blunders. It was perhaps as much owing to the simplicity of the requirements of his employers as to his own genius that Palladio was not guilty of putting sham windows into his elevations, or of making what appears to be one story on the outside two within, as his imitators too often do.

He had faults enough of his own, as we see here at Vicenza even in the midst of our admiration. Some of these may be due to those who carried out the designs rather than to the architect himself, and the blame of many of them must be shared by the Roman builders who were his models. His occasional use of pillars or pilasters mounted upon pedestals, with regard to which Ruskin has an hysterical passage in the '*Stones of Venice*,' is nothing new, as any one knows who has seen, *e. g.*, the arch of Constantine at Rome. His insertion of two stories behind such an order was a legitimate variation upon the originals. His use, and even his abuse, of the attic story was Roman before it was Palladian. The main quarrel with him is a quarrel with the problem he had set himself to solve in common with other great architects of the Renaissance, the application of the Roman orders of columns to domestic architecture; for, as Goethe says, the combination of columns and walls always remains a contradiction. But the question of this architecture is bound up with that of our entire civilization, which at that time drew from ancient Rome the influences that have ruled it ever since. Modern society set itself to the task of continuing ancient society. Latin literature perpetuated Latin ideas, and people who were brought up in the humanities very naturally decorated their houses with Corinthian columns.

Another fault charged against Palladio is that he became too great, and reduced his successors to a bondage of imitation. Well, in the following century, under Borromini and others like him, architecture took its period of frolicsome revolt, and endowed Europe with the marvels of *barocco* art. The result was, that after a time builders returned with redoubled veneration to the Palladian line and rule, so that, especially in parts of Italy and in England, there was no appeal from his precept and practice. No doubt had a genius come capable of designing a façade like that of the Certosa of Pavia, he would have burst these bonds as Samson did the green withes. But no such man appeared; the turn of the mediocrities had come. For them Palladio's rule has been beneficent; they are never at their worst when they are led by correctness, even though it be cold. Fortunately the master had solid qualities to justify his supremacy. He really knew, as none before him had, the art from which he drew his inspiration, and had made numerous drawings and restorations of the *Thermae*—in his day still in good preservation. His building, too, had good constructional features—

strength, and the appearance of strength, where it was needed; lightness and richness where it could safely be indulged in. It may be owned that these works sometimes betray the scholar rather than the man of genius; though, in general, there is a sobriety about the design that commands respect, and an elegance in the details that pleases. Perhaps it is this elegance which, as much as anything, impresses the observer; its charm is so great as to blind him to some faults and make him willing to forgive others. There is in these palaces the master quality that in their presence one feels it would have been impossible to make them as fine in any other way.

Palladio's sense of the value of simplicity and fine proportion in producing good architecture has stood others, as well as himself, in good stead. Where his influence was most felt, as in Vicenza or Milan, the cities saw the excesses of the *barocco* period pass, and were unhurt thereby. Few façades were erected there for which the builders' grandsons had to blush. As Burckhardt has justly said, the architecture of these places may be called cold and heartless, but can never be insulted by the epithet of petty (*kleinlich*). If American builders wish to free themselves from the reproach which has been brought against them of being unquiet in their works, striving for effect, they may learn at Vicenza, and from numerous villas in the neighborhood, how dignity and grace may be obtained from the fewest possible elements.

And yet Palladio could be lavish of ornament when he chose. The Palazzo del Prefettizio, though but a fragment of the intended building, shows what use he could make of sculpture. The beautiful little house popularly called Palladio's own, though without color, shows how he could reckon on the aid of painting. In one work, the Basilica, he has shown that he could combine richness with simplicity, strength, and nobility. This is perhaps his greatest achievement, and, so far as the artistic effect goes, may rank with anything that ancient Rome produced. Unfortunately it is merely a shell, to mask an earlier Gothic building; but it is always imposing, and is, in any case, the greatest ornament of Vicenza.

For the general traveller, the Olympic Theatre has perhaps more interest. In these days, when students have taken to reciting ancient plays, such a theatre, constructed essentially after the manner of Roman and Greek theatres, would greatly aid the effect of the performance, and would, not only for this reason, but as a permanent illustration of the scenic conditions for which ancient dramatists wrote, be a valuable addition to the resources of every university town.

The great churches of Palladio are at Venice. In them he was, more distinctly than in any other field, an innovator. They, however, as well as the villas scattered over the country between Venice and Vicenza, do not come within the scope of the present article. They are worthy of treatment by themselves.

Somebody recently said to us that America took a new architectural direction every year. We may hope, then, that the day is not far distant when the fashion will turn towards an ideal in which sober construction, simplicity, a refined distribution of parts, beauty of proportion, and elegance of ornament are the distinctive features. We neither ask nor hope that the Palladian style will be revived—all revivals are pernicious—but students of architecture will find it worth their while to learn how it secures the qualities just mentioned with the materials at its command. That may help them towards doing as much with theirs. For those who have already seen some of the originals we



may mention that the magnificent work of Ottavio Bertotti-Scamozzi, published in four volumes at Vicenza in 1776-83, is the best and most complete collection of the designs and constructions of Andrea Palladio. F.

## Correspondence.

### REFORMATION OF THE HOUSE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Under the caption, "A Constitutional Reformation of the House," the *Nation* advocates the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution which it formulates, providing for a continuing House of Representatives, and points out the evils of the present system in a forcible manner. But the adoption of this amendment, as formulated in the *Nation*, would be both impracticable and unwise.

The time allowed would be insufficient for its ratification by the States unless special sessions were called in many of them for that purpose; and its incorporation in the Constitution would be warring against the theory of our form of government, which contemplates the election of the Representatives of the lower branch of Congress "fresh from the people." When the question of the term of the Representatives was discussed in the Constitutional Convention, there was a diversity of opinion in regard to its duration. Some members advocated one year, some two years, and others three years. But all agreed that the House should be a changing body, and not a continuing one like the Senate. The objections to the present practice, which is not based upon any law or constitutional provision, are numerous, but the mention of a few will be sufficient to demonstrate the necessity for a change.

The House elected in November does not begin its work for thirteen months after its election, although its members draw their salaries from the 4th of March next succeeding; for nine months there is no Speaker of the House; before members have served their full term their successors are chosen; the certain determination of the second session at twelve M. on the 4th of March often prevents the passage of important measures, either from lack of time, as in the case of the Deficiency Bill last session, or because the President has not had sufficient time to examine them, as happened with the River and Harbor Bill; members are rendered more or less inefficient during the short session because they have been repudiated by the people; Representatives are chosen upon issues which may be settled when they come to the capital to enter actively upon the performance of their duties; the people in many cases are not represented by the men whom they have selected to represent them, but defeated candidates hold over in opposition to the will of the people as expressed at the polls; the month of December in the first session is practically wasted by the House on account of the holiday adjournments; and extra sessions sometimes become a necessity.

These are some of the most glaring evils. Now what is the remedy? The Hoar amendment, of which you speak commendably, if adopted, would simply lengthen the second session by two months, but would not cure the evils set forth above. It would be an improvement upon the present system, but it would fail to meet the necessities of the case.

In the editorial to which I refer, the *Nation* says—"while to postpone the assembling of Congress to the middle of winter, as was proposed by the Crain amendment, is to bring

upon ourselves two short sessions instead of one." It seems to me, with all due respect to the writer of the above-stated proposition, that he did not understand the scope of the so-called Crain amendment; and in this connection I desire to call the attention of the readers of the *Nation* to what my amendment really is, and what it undertakes to do. That it may be properly understood, I herewith give it substantially as I intend to introduce it in the House after the holidays, the phraseology having been altered from what it was in the original presented by me last winter:

"The term of members of the House of Representatives is hereby fixed at two years, and the 31st day of December, at twelve M., is hereby substituted for the 4th day of March, as the time for its commencement and limitation; provided, that the Congress in existence at the time when the members of the first House of Representatives are elected after the ratification of this amendment, shall thereafter hold no regular annual session, and that its term shall expire at noon on the 31st day of the following December, and that the term of the succeeding Congress shall thereupon begin.

"The Congress shall assemble at least once in each year, and such meeting shall be on the second Tuesday in January, unless Congress shall by law appoint a different day.

"The Senators whose terms of office would not otherwise expire until the 4th day of March after the termination of Congress by virtue of this amendment, shall continue in office until their successors shall have been appointed or elected."

Some of the benefits which would follow the adoption of this amendment will readily present themselves. The members elected in November would have sixty days in which to receive their certificates of election, prepare for contests, settle their private business, and reach the capital. There would be no holiday adjournments; the Speaker would hold continuously for two years; the House would only be about eight days without a Speaker instead of nine months; the House would be practically a continuing House to the extent that it could remain in continuous session for two years, if necessary, only adjourning long enough to comply with the constitutional requirement of an annual session; there would be two long sessions instead of two short ones, as suggested by the *Nation*; members of the House would be "fresh from the people," and at work upon the settlement of the issues upon which they were elected within sixty days after their election; the House chosen at the Presidential election would assist in the counting of the Presidential vote; there would be no failure of bills for want of time; there would be no fixed time for adjournment, except such as might be agreed upon by both houses, until the 31st day of December of the second year; there would be no election between sessions, and consequently every member would be as efficient during the second session as he was during the first; members would not hesitate between a temporary abandonment of their post of duty and a chance of defeat at home; they would have an opportunity between the sessions to visit their respective constituencies and discuss pending measures with their people; the first session would not be a game of chess between the two parties with the fall elections as the wager; and there would be no necessity for extra sessions.

Your obedient servant,

W. H. CRAIN.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 17, 1887.

[The *Nation* said that Mr. Crain's amendment would postpone the assembling of Congress "to the middle of winter." The second Tuesday of January may fall upon the eighth or the fifteenth, and either comes

pretty close to the middle of winter. It is well known how loath members are to assemble before the day when they actually must, and how loath they are to continue in session after say the first of June. To that extent, therefore, past experience (except in times of war or great public exigency) warrants us in saying that Mr. Crain's amendment will bring upon the country two short sessions instead of one.

We must, also, without being disrespectful to Mr. Crain, say that the proposed amendment is thoroughly *unconstitutional* in phraseology, style, clearness, and detail. However wise it may be in substance, it sounds a great deal more like a hasty amendment for some of the incoherent legislation of the "Statutes at Large" than for that great but simple instrument, the Constitution of the United States. The "hereby fixed," the "commencement and limitation," and the multifarious provisions forced into one sentence relating to distinct things in the first paragraph, are inexcusable in a constitutional amendment. The second paragraph is taken from the Constitution, but with needless and therefore inexcusable changes of phraseology. The third is obscure in meaning—so obscure that we doubt whether any reader can tell, without giving it several readings, what is the practical effect which it is intended to produce.—ED. NATION.]

### THE REAL DIFFICULTY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The President has justly pointed out the serious condition of the finances, but there is one thing more serious still, and that is the condition of Congress. It came together early in this month, with absolutely no plan of business, with no distinction between the thousands upon thousands of bills which are heaped upon it, and with nobody to look to for guidance. The public can only imagine—since it is carried on completely in the dark—the fearful struggle which is going on for places of power and influence on the committees. Mr. Carlisle is reported to have said that he had never seen so much difficulty in making up the committees, and it seems probable that they will not be appointed, certainly that they will not get to work, till into January—one-sixth of the session being consumed in the mere preparation for doing business. Then there is apparently to be another conflict over the House rules, that elaborate and artificial structure which has been evolved by desperate efforts to get a disorganized mob into some shape for doing business. The objective point is always the giving the more power to the majority to crush and gag the minority, modified only by the unpleasant consciousness that the majority may itself some day become a minority, and may not like the fetters it has forged for others. Of the work of the session only one thing can be predicted with certainty, namely, that the national interest, being unrepresented, will be wholly left out of sight, while the net result will be only a test of the relative strength of party, private, and local interests. I venture to quote a sentence which is not without interest:

"The republican chamber is not a convention, but it proceeds as if it was a convention; it has the Jacobin taste for omnipotence. It has created committees with the secret intention of getting hold of the Administration, of substituting itself for the Government, and sometimes even for the courts. It has had, and still has,