

3. Specific performance of such a settlement is (as always, *Robinson v. Harris*, 21 S.C.R. at p. 397) discretionary, but (if otherwise applicable) will be granted, if the settlement be reasonably fair and of an entirely "business" character.

4. If, as part of the settlement, the assistance of the court be required, such assistance may be refused when, in the opinion of the court, justice requires such a refusal.

5. Such assistance never has been and should not be refused, if the settlement be reasonably fair and of an entirely "business" character.

Toronto.

CHRISTOPHER C. ROBINSON.

SUBJECT OR CITIZEN—IMPERIAL NATURALIZATION.

To many persons, the distinction between the terms above quoted, may seem of no importance or practical consequence; yet a right understanding of it is a necessary part of our political education, and lies at the very foundation of our national existence.

Canada forms part of a monarchy, not of a republic. It is to the Sovereign who represents the state, that our allegiance is due, and it is that personal tie between the Sovereign and his people that makes the difference between the subject of a King, and the citizen of a republic. So long as the monarchy endures subjects we must remain, nor is there anything in the term to disturb our self-respect, or threaten our liberty. By the theory of our constitution, the throne is the fountain of justice and of honour, and it is to the Sovereign that we look for the administration of the one and preservation of the other. Subjects we are to our King—that is the cord that binds us together as one great family; equal we are to each other in our right to the protection of the laws which govern alike the sovereign and his people—in that we have the guarantee of our liberty. Such is the theory.

Now is there anything in its results which should make