ciples which lie at the roots of administrative law in England, are not distinguishable from those which are at the roots of the whole system of British law—that in England the term Administrative Law is entirely one of convenience, and by no means frequently used. There is not, in Britain, one law for the citizen and another law for the official. The latter may have special duties and functions, for the performance of which he is answerable, but he enjoys no immunities from the consequence of illegal acts. He cannot plead the authority of the Crown, or of his superior, for an illegal act. The logical corollary of the maxim that "The King can do no wrong," is, that some other person is legally and individually responsible, for every act done in the King's name.

Under the French system on the other hand, no servant of the government, who, without any malicious or corrupt motive, executes the orders of his superiors, is civilly responsible for his conduct. For the breach of official discipline he is, it may be safely assumed, readily punishable in some form or another, but he neverthless enjoys a very large amount of protection against legal procedings for wrongs done to private citizens. The party wronged by an official in France, must seek relief, not from the judges of the land, but from some official Court. Before such a Court, the question which will be mainly considered, is likely to be, not whether the complainant has been injured, but whether the defendant, say a policeman, has acted in discharge of his duties and in bona fide obedience to the command of his superiors. [1]

In these pages, however, we use the convenient term administrative law, not as implying the existence of a special code applicable only to state officials, but

[1] Law of the Constitution, Dicey. p. 319.