

the Montreal police, which are as yet, *sub judice*, but to call attention to the prevalence of an evil of great and growing magnitude, whose rootlets seem to permeate every department of social and public life.

Those among our readers who can recall their first experiences in travelling will no doubt remember how, for a time, it was a mystery to them that, in the crowded dining-hall of steamboat or hotel, for instance, though all were charged the same prices, some invariably secured the best places and the most assiduous attentions. If these favored ones were not at hand when the gong sounded, they came in late only to find eligible seats reserved for them and obsequious waiters ready to take their orders, while less fortunate fellow-travellers, though they might have been in such places as they could secure much earlier, were obliged to bide their time and content themselves with less efficient service rendered, very often, with scantier courtesy. The same mysterious preferences and gradations in the attentions of servants were probably observed in the handling of baggage and in other little matters in which the comfort of the boarder or the passenger depended upon the willing service of those who, he fondly supposed, were employed and paid to perform such services for all alike. Under the tutelage of some more experienced friend the mystery has finally resolved itself into the simple but expensive process denoted by the little word "tipping."

Is there really any difference in kind between the act of the waiter who, being employed and paid, or supposed to be, to wait upon all who are under his care without partiality or distinction, accepts a small gratuity with the tacit understanding that he will give special attention to the giver and his friends, and that of the detective who, employed and paid by the city to do his best for all who require his services, reserves his zeal and best professional skill for the benefit of clients able and willing to cross his palm with a gold coin, or stay its itching with a bank note, and who treats with cool neglect those unable or unwilling to do so? And is not the act of the legislator who tacitly binds himself, by the acceptance of a pass on the railway, or the gift of a hundred or five hundred dollars worth of salable stock, or bonds, or bank notes, to promote the interests of his benefactor at the expense of those of the public, in any case that may come up for legislation, a transaction of a very similar kind?

We are often strangely blind to the consequences of our own actions. For the sake of a trifling convenience, obtained usually at the expense of others equally entitled to it, but not equally able or disposed to pay a second price for it, we, without compunction, bribe an official to betray his trust in what we deem a small matter, while we would, without hesitation, condemn to dismissal or to prison another official for doing a thing precisely the same in principle

on a broader scale and for a larger bribe. In the first case, no less than in the second, the acceptance of the gift tends not only to undermine the self-respect, but to blunt or destroy the sense of duty, of the individual who yields to the temptation. In each case the public servant suffers himself to be placed under obligation to the individual to whom he stands, or may at any moment be required to stand, in the relation of an impartial arbiter.

Of the many moral evils which are rampant in the state to-day and which threaten its highest well-being, there is probably none greater or more dangerous than that which arises from the ever-recurring betrayals of trust for personal gain. The waiter is bribed in the hotel, the conductor on the train, the policeman on his "beat," the juror in court, even the representative in Parliament. The bribery is not always, perhaps not often, direct and gross. It is not generally admitted to be such by either the giver or the taker, even to his own conscience. Nevertheless the truth remains that the gift, whether subtle and under plausible disguise, or open and direct, is given and taken. The fountains of private and public honor are corrupted. The moral tone of society is lowered. The integrity of the state is impaired. The money of the taxpayer is misappropriated, and the treasury of the nation defrauded in a thousand ways, some of which are from time to time brought to light, while many others, it is reasonable to infer, may never be detected.

While it is wise and necessary to guard in every proper way, by stringent legislation and by lynx-eyed scrutiny, against such practices in civic and national life, it is evident that these methods of reform do not go deep enough to touch the root of the evil. The radical cure, if one is ever found, must reach the national conscience, and through it elevate the national sense of honor. To the thoughtful it must often seem strange that a man, be he a public servant of lower rank accepting a "tip," or a member of Parliament pocketing a railway pass, who as a private individual would scorn to accept a free gift from the hand of the charitable, can allow his sense of what is proper and right to be so easily befogged by specious excuses when the gift comes to him in a public or quasi-public capacity. And yet what can we expect from those in lower positions, when it is stated in the public press, without contradiction, that the members of the Dominion Parliament who do not travel on free passes given by the railway companies can be counted on one's fingers without using all the digits, and when a Cabinet Minister can stand up in Parliament and declare that he sees nothing wrong in the giving and receiving for the benefit of his political party, of large sums of money from a Governmental contractor? The giving and taking of gifts were, ages ago, denounced as the chief

agencies in perverting justice and destroying morality in Oriental monarchies. Is there not great danger that the same vicious practices are no less undermining the foundations of stability in Western democracies?

## A JAPANESE SYSTEM OF BUDDHIST ETHICS.

The following paper on Japanese ethics has been almost entirely taken from modern Japanese sources, and will, I trust, be found useful to all those that are interested in the development of religious thought. To such persons, whatever their religious or sectarian prejudices may be, the present revival of Buddhism cannot fail to be of the greatest interest. There can be no doubt of the fact that Buddhism is rousing itself to a conflict with her great and aggressive rival; that she is bringing forth from her armoury and furbishing up all her ancient weapons that have lain dormant for so long in the treasure houses of her temples; that she is strengthening her forces by all the new armoury with which an age of scientific investigation, historical research, and higher criticism can furnish her; and that the coming conflict promises to be one of the most deeply interesting conflicts that the Church of Christ has experienced.

Having said so much I need make no further apology, but may, I think, plunge straight into my subject.

All moral duties are based upon the *Four Favours* (*Shi On*), i.e., the benefits which we have received from four different quarters, and the duties which we consequently owe to those from whom we have received them.

Our life, character, social position, development, etc., are determined by our relationships (i.) to our parents, (ii.) to mankind at large, (iii.) to our sovereign, (iv.) to our religion. From these four sources we have received all that we have and are still daily receiving innumerable favours; and our moral conduct, therefore, is conditioned by our duties towards these four.

I. *Our parents* (*fubo no on*). It is to our parents that we owe our very existence. Without them we should never have come into the world. Our mothers have given to us the tedious months of pregnancy, the pains and dangers of childbirth, often accompanied with the sacrifice of life itself, the years of loving care during which they have fed us, watched over us, tended us, until our independent life has been able to stand by itself and our need of constant personal supervision and assistance has died away. It is from our mothers that we have learned our first lessons and our first prayers.

Nor has the part played by the father been a less important one. If our mothers have borne the pain, our fathers have had the anxiety. They have worked for us, and by their work have provided the means for our maintenance and education. Whatever rank in life they have had, has been ours by inheritance, to improve or to deteriorate. Whatever good there may be in a father's name it has been ours as a *locus a quo* in the making or marring of our own fortunes.

It requires, therefore, no elaborate proof to show that we owe to our parents duties of a very substantial nature in return for what we have received from them. These are defined as follows: