

date indeed. Great have been the changes since 1792, and in so far as these changes have tended to openness of mind and heart, to love of the true and beautiful, to scorn of shams and recognition of the spiritual in man, Shelley may be recognized as one of the strongest factors of progress. For what in the past he has accomplished, humanity owes the poet of spirituality the highest honours, and for that if no other reason, the coming date will be a memorable one, and will merit the highest honours. And the highest honours will be paid. Movements are on foot; and lest Canada should lag behind, already a note is sounded for preparation. In an article in a late number of the *Week*, Mr. T. Arnold Haultain has the honour of leading the way. His contribution is itself an addition to Shelley literature. He has touched upon the debt we owe Shelley for the past, but has devoted more attention to his relations to the present. "What are to us," says Mr. Haultain, "the questions of prime importance, the problems most frequently discussed, the lines of thought chiefly occupying the public mind? Surely they are largely of a sociological nature. The rights and duties of the individual considered as an integral portion of the community are now the subjects of books, of magazine articles, of public deliberations. Society in all its complex aspects is the study begun by this last decade of the nineteenth century. The Renaissance was the period of intellectual and artistic activity; the Reformation of religious activity; the French Revolution of political activity; the nineteenth century of scientific activity; the twentieth century will be the period of sociological activity, and we to-day are the witnesses of its birth. But what has this to do with our interest in Shelley? Everything. It is just because Shelley, poet though he was, was so intensely interested in sociological problems, and was so intensely modern in the solutions he proposed for them that to-day he is able to speak to us, not as with an alien voice, unintelligible and far distant, but as if he were amongst us and one of us. Indeed, in this he is more than a modern. 'He is emphatically,' says Mr. Rossetti, writing in 1886, 'the poet of the future.'"

This quotation will show Mr. Haultain's method of treating Shelley. After passing in review previous commentators on Shelley,

touching them with a firm yet light hand, he goes on to say: "England, I say, is intending to celebrate the centenary of the nativity of her greatest lyrical poet; the Shelley society are collecting subscriptions for another representation of the "Cenci;" a concordance to his poetical works is ready for publication, and doubtless more than a few books and magazine articles will commemorate his birth. Could not Canada contribute her share to the celebration?" The method Mr. Haultain proposes is that of a memorial volume of verse or prose. Among possible contributors he mentions M. Louis Honore Frechette, Prof. Chas. G. D. Roberts, Mr. Mair, "Fidelis," Mr. W. D. LeSueur, "Sarepta," Mr. Archibald Lampman, Mr. W. W. Campbell, Prof. Alexander, "Seranus," Dr. Archibald MacMechan and Miss Ethelwyn Wetherald. The author has forgotten his own name, and certainly the amount of accurate, penetrating criticism he has condensed into two or three columns, and of which I have given only a portion substantiates his claim to be a critic and a lover of Shelley.

C. F. H.

CONTRIBUTED.

[The Editor is not responsible for the opinions of correspondents, but only for the propriety of inserting them.]

To the Editor of the Journal:

DEAR SIR,—Permit me to make a short reply to a letter in your last number signed "Anti-Party." In the first place, the students went, not as this gentleman seems to think, to make a row or to show their partizanship, but to ensure Mr. Preston a fair hearing, which he certainly would not have got had we not been there.

Next, your correspondent sacrifices truth and does not even gain point. To call Mr. Preston "their cheeky antagonist" is simply absurd. Even those who disagreed with him admitted that his was an honest and straightforward speech, and utterly free from anything unseemly or offensive. Anti-Party, again, is somewhat unfortunate in saying that "Professors Watson, Cappon, Fletcher and MacNaughton do not attend political meetings," for I can assure him that two of them at least were at the meetings held by Messrs. Tupper, Thompson and Laurier, and for anything I know at the