

wire pullers have to reckon with."—*Daily Telegraph*, April 8, 1880.

Had and Would.—The colloquial use of the same contraction *I'd* for *I had* and *I would* has been extended imperceptibly into writing and printing, with results that threaten to supersede *would* altogether and to replace it most improperly by *had*. Some of our ablest writers have fallen into this inelegancy, or allowed their printers to do so—among others Mr. Thackeray, who says in "The Virginians," "I *had* rather have lost an arm;" and Mr. Carlyle, who has "a doom for Quashee (the negro) which I *had* rather not contemplate," instead of "*would* rather not." Instances of this unnecessary corruption of the word are to be found so far back as the days of Shakespeare, and a century later in the usually well written and classical pages of "The Tatler" and "The Spectator."

When *had* is followed by the word *better*, as in the phrase "you had better," it is an improper substitute for

would, though "you *had* better do so and so" has the small advantage of being more laconic than the synonymous phrase, "*It would be better* if you did so and so." When *had* is followed by *have*, its use is still more ungrammatical. Thus when the *Times*, March 12, 1879, says, "Sir Wilfrid Lawson *had* better *have* kept to his original proposal," it means that "Sir Wilfrid Lawson *would have* done better to keep, or to have kept, to his original proposal." So also the *Spectator*, March 2, 1879, when it wrote, "The motion *had* better be withdrawn," was guilty of a permissible colloquialism, but was grammatically incorrect, and should have written, "It *would* be better if the motion were withdrawn." In like manner the *Examiner* fell into the prevalent carelessness, when it wrote, March 2, 1879, "If the University of London, after an existence of forty years, cannot produce a competent man, it *had* better cease to exist."—*Gentleman's Magazine*. (To be continued.)

QUEEN'S COLLEGE CONVOCATION.

CHANCELLOR FLEMING'S ADDRESS ON UNIVERSITY DEGREES.—II.

(Continued from page 200.)

IT is evident to us all that education consists of two parts. First, that by which the mind and character of man are formed, by which he is taught habits of thrift or self-control, of industry and effort, by which he is fitted to fill an honourable place in life and become a worthy member of society. Second, the technical knowledge of a calling by which he may get his bread and live.

The advocates of the ancient languages appear to me to rest their argument principally on the ground that their study forms the best means

of attaining culture. They assert that the study of classics furnishes the best mental discipline, and that it is preferable to any other training for the permanent beneficial influence which it exercises on the character of the individual. The argument is as powerfully contradicted by authorities equally commanding respect. They contend that a training in the laws and principles and known facts of science, exercises an equally beneficial influence on the mind, and that for the purpose of attaining true culture a familiarity with modern litera-