sons of the first pair, undoubtedly designed by God, took up different occupations, and thus labor had its origin of real division. Since that time it has continued to divide, as the world has advanced, until to-day it is almost impossible to divide it further.

Like every great question, it has, throughout the world, interested those who for various reasons uphold it, possibly for personal advantages, and those who for similar reasons reject it. However, all such questions are debatable. They have their advantages and disadvantages, and we are to choose for ourselves that which seems best to serve the general welfare.

The question might be asked, and quite consistently too, what is meant by the "division of labor." Well, as Political Economy is the science of wealth, it is its object to treat wealth from every possible standpoint effecting it. Now as its production is surely one of its most important objects, we must consider it from this point and discuss the aids to production. Thus the real subject of our essay lies in aids to production and we can readily see how important an aid is this division of labor. Really it is that separation of the different means of man's sustenance into its various classes. It is a natural separation designed by God, who has in the creation of man endowed him with different aptitudes and faculties. Thus the division of labor embraces all branches of work occupying man.

We understand quite clearly that this division has always existed, at least since the time of Adam, yet such division may be considered in a general way. But with the advent of machinery, which by the way is another great aid to production, a different division of labor is introduced, which division we may consider the particular. The invention of machinery has rendered man capable of producing scores of times as much produce of all kinds as he was capable of without its assistance. And when I say it introduces a new division of labor, I mean that in any particular branch in which machinery is employed men grow proficient, not in the whole branch, but in an individual or a particular portion of it. Thus in the general class, a man is a farmer, being more or less capable of performing all the operations required on a farm, but a man can scarcely be called a shoemaker who devotes himself wholly to the operation of lasting the shoe. He is considered a laster, not a shoemaker. Thus we have the particular class.

This division of labor certainly has its advantages. We can readily comprehend how a man who devotes his entire attention