

either on land or under the water, and what is the consequence? Are we not deprived of our daily news. Can the press in this dilemma furnish it without that aid? No, indeed. Does not these facts, then, lead to the conviction that the press is not all potential. Obliterate entirely the telegraph and railroad, and what becomes of the boasted enlightener? It would then simply be a local disseminator of news. It is thus seen at a glance, without these twin co-laborers, the "art preservative" would be a mere bagatelle.

Look into other branches of industries. It is but a few years ago that boots and shoes were entirely made by hand. Now, are they? Go into any large shoe factory, and there you will see machinery in operation that not only cuts the leather, but actually pegs and sews the shoe, requiring only a guiding hand to bring them out finished and complete, ready for the wearer.

The same marks of advancement is also seen in the field of agriculture. Implements of various kinds and devices have been introduced, almost wonderful to contemplate. Labor-saving and time-saving machinery are now used that probably were not thought of a few decades since, doing away with the heavy drudgery that the over-worked farmer had to undergo to make his fields profitable and to feed the toiling millions that inhabit large cities everywhere.

In order not to lengthen out this article more than is actually necessary for my purpose, I will not attempt to enumerate the other branches of industries in the land, but will simply say that the same progress made in one branch can be seen in all others, thus showing that the elevation of man is not entirely confined to the printing press alone, but all contribute their equal quota to his prosperity and happiness.

The reasons generally given to show that printing is the "art preservative," is simply that it records history as it is made, and hands it down to future posterity for their enlightenment and benefit. This is all true and cannot be controverted. But is there nothing else that can do almost equally as well? Cannot the artist, who has finished his master-piece, duplicate the same, and cannot the same be done over again a thousand years hence as now? Have not the books which first emanated from the press of Caxton, Faust, and others, to be reprinted? What has become of all of them? It is a well-known fact that but few of them are in existence, and these few, no matter how care-

fully guarded and watched, will some day or other pass away from all living things. Thus, I believe, that every branch of industry that can duplicate and multiply itself, and keep itself in existence for untold years, is equally entitled to the same privilege of claiming itself able to preserve itself without the aid of the press.

There is one point in particular that I wish to lay more stress on than another. It is this, that printing does not preserve itself or its followers more than any other industry does. I claim that any branch of industry, boasting that it is superior than any other, should have vitality and life enough in it to keep its artisans from almost pauperism, which the printing business of to-day does not. Look at the thousands of printers all over this land and Europe, and what is their condition? Are they any degrees above the men that delve and dig with the pick and shovel, who only require physical and not mental labor to worry through the day. I cannot be convinced that there is any more advantage in a printing office than there is in a shoemaker shop, when the printer gets no more than the shoemaker. It is generally conceded that where brains are most wanted there is the most pay, but it don't seem to be so with the poor disciples of Faust.

When the time comes—should it ever come—that the printer is lifted far above the level that he occupies now, then it will be time enough to boast that printing is the "art preservative." Printers have to struggle for even a paltry existence, like thousands of other mechanics. But why should it be, if the profession they follow is looked upon as the "art preservative?" Surely there ought to be enough in it to protect him from penury and want. It may be a low standard to ground my arguments upon, but, nevertheless, they are true and cannot be gainsaid.

Printing offices, like other callings, are springing up on every hand. Some are short-lived and some are long-lived. But why do they become defunct at all, when they are following the "art preservative of all arts?" Surely something must be wrong somewhere. According to the theories of the art, they ought to exist for ever. Here again we see the inconsistency of the quotation.

I could advance other arguments and theories in advocacy of the side that I have taken. But I think I have given enough in the short space I have at my command, to, at least, receive a