

times which has made far the greatest success in uniting together the principle of popular government—for the government of England is quite as democratic and popular as ours—the principle of the direction of affairs by the general opinion of the people, with the use of permanent expert officials. Of course, England did not introduce that recently into her government; she did not set it up by any artificial process. She, in the main, inherited it.

It is true, as Governor Baldwin says, that it was the reforms of Lord Palmerston, and so forth, that introduced it in the form in which we have it now. But it goes very much further back, and behind this particular method of recruiting the permanent officials by means of examination, comes the fact of the permanent official himself, and his relation to the man who represents the public and who is elected.

You may see that running back through the system of English government, running back through it because, perhaps, it was, to some extent, an aristocratic system. As someone has said, the characteristic thing in England is the justice of the peace who is a gentleman, with the clerk who knows the law. And that same relation of the justice of the peace and his clerk runs all through the system of government in England today; the justice of the peace, representing the ignorant public, being the gentleman, and the clerk representing the knowledge of the law. You may find that running back through literature, as far back as the days of Elizabeth.

You are all familiar with the case which Dickens presents in the *Pickwick Papers*, where Mr. Pickwick is called up before the justice of the peace at Ipswich, and Mr. Jinks is clerk. Mr. Pickwick says:—

“First, I wish to know what I and my friend have been brought here for?”

“Must I tell him?” whispered the magistrate to Jinks.

“I think you had better, sir,” whispered Jinks to the magistrate.

“An information has been sworn before me,” said the magistrate, “that it is apprehended you are going to fight a duel, and that the other man, Tupman, is your aider and abetter in it. Therefore—eh, Mr. Jinks?”

“Certainly, sir.”

“Therefore, I call upon you both, to—think that’s the course, Mr. Jinks?”

“Certainly, sir.”

“To—to—what, Mr. Jinks?” said the magistrate pettishly.

“To find bail, sir.”

“Yes. Therefore, I call upon you both—as I was about to say, when I was interrupted by my clerk—to find bail.”

Now, you can see that every day. If you study the government of England today, you find that all the time. You hear the minister coming forward and answering a question in Parliament. You know perfectly well that his statement was written by the permanent secretary behind him. When you hear the question: “What was the relative amount of Protestant property destroyed in the riot at Belfast?” and you hear the minister’s reply: “£6,542 of Protestant property and £5,420 12s 6d of Catholic property,” you do not suppose the minister knows that. Of course not. He gets it from his permanent secretary behind him.

The whole essence of the British Government is the fact of having behind every man who stands for the popular opinion of the public, another man who knows the expert way of doing the work.

In the administration of the law, you have the judge and the jury. What is that but the expert and the layman? You must always combine the expert and the layman in order to have successful government. We have the layman and we have no ex-