

brothers van Eyck and of the brothers de Limbourg, who were contemporaries, and of other miniaturists such as Fouquet and Jean Colombe, one is reminded that painting does not advance; rather, it goes in circles. We find a pure nocturne, a nocturne that Whistler might have been proud to sign, in Pol de Limbourg's "Christ in the Garden of Olives" at Chantilly, painted about 1415; and in Fouquet's "Cæsar Crossing the Rubicon," done about 1460, there is a foretelling of the decorative treatment of lances that Velasquez was to use with such magnificent effect in "The Surrender of Breda." And there is a small landscape in the "Hours of Turin," that happily escaped the fire which destroyed most of this precious book, so simple, beautiful, and accomplished that it ranks as one of the world's landscapes. It has been called "Baptism of Christ, or River View," and it is probably by Hubert van Eyck. This master may justly be called

the Father of Landscape Painting. He showed an intimate love of nature in days before landscape painting was regarded as a serious branch of art. In the Cook Collection at Richmond hangs his early landscape "The Three Marys at the Sepulcher," painted about 1425, a dawn scene, the hour when the holy women visited the sepulcher. The sun has just risen; the flushed towers catch the rays, their bases are in shadow.

No, painting does not advance; it goes in circles. A period becomes memorable because a great man happened to be painting in that period. His influence forms a school; numbers try to paint like him, and so it goes on until another master arises. What has changed, and the change is for the worse, is that we call ourselves to-day artists, not craftsmen. The old painters, even the masters, were content to do, and not to explain the processes of their thought. I do not suppose that Hubert van Eyck or Pol de

Limbourg ever reasoned about what they did; they painted, and their work is great because they had learned to look, and had trained their hands to follow their eyes. I wonder what either of these masters would have made of Mr. Roger Fry's pamphlet, or small book, called "The Artist and Psycho-Analysis." It is interesting to me because it is an introduction to the processes of Mr. Roger Fry's literary mind. He is a writer by temperament, and a painter by desire. I could make rather an interesting list, giving examples from America and England, of artists who write better than they paint. Some write almost as well as they paint. Of such were van Gogh and Gauguin. By the by, Gauguin's vivid picture, "Jacob Struggling with the Angel," a moving subject, painted with intense conviction, has just been acquired by the National Gallery of Scotland. Post-impressionism, once reviled, is now receiving the hall-mark of officialdom.

Dawes and Delay

By CARTER FIELD

This discussion of Senatorial procedure from the pen of a veteran Washington correspondent is an illuminating study of the way the wheels of our Government go—or do not go—round

SHALL the Senate stop wasting time? If the "world's greatest deliberative body" does expedite its business, will the country be better off as the result of the greatly increased amount of legislation which will result?

With his usual picturesque and spectacular mode of doing things, Vice-President Charles G. Dawes has put the first question squarely before the country. Indications are unmistakable that the country is with him and against the endless flood of words which ties up so much business in the Senate.

But indications are just as unmistakable that a majority of the Senators have no intention of imposing cloture on themselves, even to please "Helen Maria." The Senators are pretty well satisfied with things as they are. Certainly it requires little short of an earthquake to change Senate rules.

The second question—whether the country would be better off as the result of eliminating filibusters—is being much discussed in Washington, with a view generally contrary to that taken in the country as a whole, if one may judge the opinion of the country by the editorials which have been printed since General Dawes lectured the Senate.

In the controversy which rages over

the second question, curiously enough, General Dawes is in somewhat of a paradoxical position. He has always been regarded as a conservative in politics. He first attained fame as a lieutenant of the late Mark Hanna, who was, to say the least, eminently practical.

The Less, the Better

By and large, the average conservative believes that the less new legislation, the better. Every forward-looking step is viewed by the men whose political views have been supposed to agree with General Dawes with the keenest suspicion.

Old-line Republicans like Senator Wadsworth, of New York, and Senator Reed, of Pennsylvania, have even come to champion the old-fashioned Democratic theory of State's rights, driven to this position because of the increasing interference, as they describe it, of the National Government with questions which they believe should be reserved for State action. Of course it may be that they are swayed just a little by the fact that most of the kind of bills they oppose on this ground tend to take money from the richer States for the benefit of the poorer.

Agitation to force the Senate to revise its rules so as to make it impossible for

any small group to prevent the passage of any given piece of legislation to which they are opposed is as old as the Senate itself. It has come up periodically as the logical aftermath of every filibuster big enough to have attracted Nation-wide attention.

Again and again Senators who happened to be in the majority favoring some measure being strangled by a filibuster have voiced caustic criticism of their colleagues for using such a weapon. It requires very little delving back to discover that the Senators loudest in the denouncing, however, have generally, at some period in their Senatorial careers, resorted to this weapon to kill some earlier measure to them obnoxious.

The blunt language of General Dawes was no rougher than that which has frequently been employed by Senators in discussing their own rules. Just to cite one example: Senator Charles S. Thomas, of Colorado, became annoyed back in February, 1915, because a considerable group of Republican Senators, aided eventually by seven Democrats, ran a filibuster which prevented passage of the so-called Wilson Ship Purchase Bill.

"If it is in order," said Mr. Thomas, with all the sarcasm he could command, "I should like to move that a committee

be appointed to inform the President that the Senate has been in session since the 7th of December and that owing to the character of its rules it is unable to do business."

The motion was ruled out of order. A moment later Senator George Sutherland, of Utah, now a member of the Supreme Court, inquired of Senator William J. Stone, of Missouri, how the sergeant-at-arms could arrest Senators to hale them to the Senate chamber if he could not find them.

This same filibuster was perhaps the most spectacular in the history of the Senate. Toward the end of it the Senate remained in continuous session for fifty-four hours and ten minutes in a desperate and unsuccessful effort to wear the talkers out. It was during this "talkfest" that Senator Reed Smoot, of Utah, talked for eleven hours and twenty-five minutes without a single moment's relief.

"Battling Bob" La Follette once held the floor for more than seventeen hours, but he was relieved thirty times during this ordeal by quorum calls and dilatory roll-calls, so that Mr. Smoot's performance is generally accepted as the real record.

The Straw that Strained the Camel

IT was the La Follette speech just alluded to, however, which brought the first revision of Senate rules aimed at eventual cloture. On that occasion—it was in May, 1908—Senator La Follette with supporters talked the Aldrich-Vreeland Currency Bill to death. In the next session of Congress the Senate rules were amended so that a quorum call may not be demanded as a point of order unless some business has intervened since the last quorum call, and the new rule provided that speaking did not constitute business. It was this rule, together with another rule that a Senator may not speak more than twice on the same subject on the same legislative day, which resulted in the ordeals of Senator Smoot and others seven years later when they wished to kill the Ship Purchase Bill.

The advantage of keeping in continuous session is, not only that it wears out, presumably, the talkers, but that it maintains the same legislative day. This last result is also attained at times by merely recessing until the next day, instead of adjourning.

Just two years after the killing of the Ship Purchase Bill by a filibuster came the straw which broke the camel's back. This was the famous filibuster of the "willful men," as they were called by

President Wilson, which prevented passage of the "Armed Neutrality" Bill in the closing days of the Congress which ended March 4, 1917. President Wilson still hoped at that time to keep the country out of war, but the little group of "willful men," headed by La Follette, feared that the Wilson plan for protecting shipping against submarine attack would surely lead to this country's being drawn into the war.

It is believed by many Senators and observers in Washington that even this provocation would not have been sufficient of an "earthquake" to have brought about a change in the Senate rules had it not been for the war spirit, already surging throughout the country.

It is a tradition that the country has very little patience with Congress. It is a political axiom that every President who has attacked Congress in public letters and speeches has won an immediate and vigorous response. So in this particular case the country became indignant that a mere handful of Senators, only twelve, had been able to thwart the will of their eighty-odd colleagues and of President Wilson.

So intense was the popular demand, Senators being deluged with letters and telegrams, that in the special session of the Senate which President Wilson called at once a cloture rule was for the first time in the Senate's history adopted. This is the famous Rule 22, which General Dawes attacked so bitterly.

It provides, briefly, that sixteen Senators, by presenting a petition, can, after a delay of two days, force a vote on the question of restricting the normal rights of Senators to talk as long as they please. To enforce the cloture, however, it is necessary that a two-thirds majority of the Senate shall vote for it, and even after that each Senator may speak for not more than one hour on the bill or question for which the cloture is invoked.

That is the way the rule stands at present. Senator Underwood, on the day following General Dawes's blast, submitted a new rule which would permit a majority of the Senate to invoke cloture, still reserving the right of each Senator to speak for one hour.

It may be stated very flatly that there is little chance of this proposed rule, or anything approaching it, being adopted. The reason it has so little chance has little to do with the question of whether the country would be benefited. It has to do with the power exercised under the present rules by individual Senators.

There is always a legislative jam toward the close of any session of Congress, particularly, of course, those sessions which are terminated on a day

designated by law. In such a jam individual Senators and small groups of Senators push through bills in which they are personally interested and block those to which they have any objections. It is a highly satisfactory arrangement to the Senators, though they do not like to talk much about it publicly. It is a situation which enhances the importance and power of a Senator tremendously.

A Tillman Barricade

THE best story illustrating the curious lengths to which this power is carried is that of Senator Tillman, of South Carolina, "Pitchfork Ben." Mr. Tillman learned that a bill carrying a war claim of 1812 of \$90,000 for South Carolina had been held up in the House. He barricaded his desk with books and announced his intention to read "Childe Harold" and other works of Lord Byron until the end of the session.

Word of this threat was speedily carried to Uncle Joe Cannon, who at the time was Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. At first Mr. Cannon was stubborn, but when he realized how many bills to which there was no objection had not at that moment been passed by the Senate, he yielded, and South Carolina got the \$90,000.

This is an unusual incident only because it happened to be spectacular. On a small scale that sort of thing happens toward the close of every session, and happens repeatedly, generally without any publicity at all, because it is only when the attempted maneuver is thwarted that the indignant Senator resorts to a move which attracts publicity.

As a matter of fact the present cloture rule, though it has been on the books since 1917, has been utilized on only one occasion. That was on November 15, 1919, when cloture was imposed on the Versailles Treaty debate. Several times petitions have been started, but in every other case either it was discovered that a two-thirds vote could not be mustered, or else opposition dissipated and it became possible to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote.

The Good Survive

IT is the conviction, frequently expressed, of many Senators that no really meritorious measure ever died because of a filibuster. This may or may not be true, but there is very strong objection on the part of many Senators, entirely aside from any personal loss of power, to the prospect of the Senate's being speeded up to the pace of the House. They fear that the deluge of legislation which would result would be far from an unmixed blessing.

Old Themes in



“Madonna with the Sea-Gulls”

At the Carnegie Institute of Pittsburgh an exhibition of paintings by Anto Carte serves to present the work of a Belgian artist whose paintings have not previously been shown in America. Like the painters of the Renaissance, he has given a contemporary touch to the historic figures he has chosen to celebrate