

preceding my visit, these children had toiled from 7 a. m. to 5 p. m. at their unhealthy and exhausting labor.

It is hardly necessary to state that on every floor of the mill the hands were exposed to many and great dangers from unprotected bands and wheels, and from insufficiently fenced shafting; these are the invariable features of factory labor without any official regulations. On the whole, I cannot conceive a case more clear and simple; the Hindoo children are surely entitled to the same protection which the law has so long afforded to "young persons" in the United Kingdom.

With regard to the natives of India generally, I had of course, in a short stay at Kurachee and Bombay, no opportunity of looking widely or deeply into their condition. But it appears that there is a strong disposition in the minds of leading men in the Government of India toward fair treatment, and even liberality, in official dealings with natives. There are, however, two grievances, both wide-spread, and both of the highest importance, which are heard of in every part of India, and which appear to baffle the wisest and most conscientious legislators.

"True," says the native subject of the Empress of India, "you have given us good government. You are mercilessly punctual and exacting in your demands, and the unflinching regularity and uniformity of these charges are, some say, almost perhaps as painful as would be the varying leniency and rapacity of native rulers. But, under your rule, that which we have, we possess in safety; where we lose is in the fact that the expenditure of Government and of the governing body is not made in India, but in England." The complaint is, indeed, very much the same as that which comes with great force from Ireland. The crown of Great Britain, like a great absentee landlord, collects a vast rent-roll in India, which is expended in the savings of civil and military servants transmitted and retained in England—in their clothing, and in the many articles of food and luxury which are purchased in England. Even the trappings of state pageantry bear the mark of London. "In all this," say the natives, "we lose greatly. If we had native rulers, they not would be so invariably just, nor would peace and order be so secure; they perhaps would lavish money in fighting, and squander other sums in semi-barbaric display. But all their outlay would be with us, and among ourselves." It cannot be denied that there is very much which is, to say the least, plausible in this line of argument.

For the other grievance the means of remedy or alleviation are less difficult. This relates to the land, and to the property of the cultivators. They borrow small sums at high rates of interest; they are ignorant; they are sometimes unfortunate; their simple agriculture is peculiarly at the mercy of the seasons. Principal and interest are added and re-added; the money-lenders are perhaps dishonest, and obtain acknowledgment of a document the real nature of the contents of which is unknown to the poor ignorant peasant. At last the debt, or alleged

debt, with its quickly mounting interest, has become big enough to bear comparison with the value of the unhappy rayah's interest in the land, upon which the toil of his whole life has been bestowed. Then he is hurried by the money-lender before the English magistrate; the debt, or alleged debt, is proved. By what process this proof is accomplished the peasant is often profoundly ignorant. No account is taken of the circumstances; the inexorable logic of written evidence—the verdict of the British rule—is all against him; judgment is given, and in the end his little property is sold to the money-lender, who has from first to last made a very successful transaction. Meanwhile the peasant, with a heart full of bitterness, has gone to ruin, bearing with him, in his destitution, a miserable sense that he has been jostled out of his homestead with the sanction of an English judge.

The Englishman urges that, under native rule, things would be much the same. Men must pay their debts. "No," says the native, "it would not be so under native rule. Native justice is wilder, less terribly regular, less legal, but probably more equitable. The rayah, under native rule, would have a better chance against the money-lender." And in this conclusion the native objector is, no doubt, to some extent justified. Here, then, is one of the most difficult of legislative problems for the consideration of Indian legislators. Would it be judicious—we cannot deny that it is possible—to give tenure which should be free from responsibility for debt—to give the cultivator something which the money-lender could not claim? Every man would like to be, if even to some extent only, invulnerable, so that in which ever direction "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" might fly, these could not wound him irreparably. Every one would like to have security against being stripped naked by creditors, and turned, helpless and shivering upon the desert of utter and extreme poverty. Would not the end be, that the borrowing would continue with heightened rates of interest, and the rayah, under this coveted protection, would fall into poverty more extended and miserable than even he has yet known?

MOHAMMEDANISM IN EGYPT.

In Egypt, we see Mohammedanism through a veneer of Parisian civilization. The Khedive, a Mussulman in *gants de Paris*, is in fact the *entrepreneur* of the country, concerning which his highness deals with the financiers of Europe. His personality as a ruler never appears to rise out of the business of entertaining, concessionizing, and loan-mongering, in which, to the outside world, his highness seems always to be engaged. Mr. Cave had just left Egypt when we arrived in the country; and during our railway journey between the two capitals, Cairo and Alexandria, an incident occurred, which I give for what it is worth, but which seemed to me to be very truly illustrative of the Government of Egypt. Certainly it displayed what Egyptians think practicable and probable in the way of