

THE ROYAL BANK OF CANADA.

The Merchants Bank of Halifax has changed the name under which it was incorporated in 1864, to the Royal Bank of Canada.

"What's in a name?" It is quite certain that the founders of the Merchants' Bank of Halifax, when selecting a name, never contemplated extending their business beyond the boundaries of Nova Scotia, and could not have dreamed of a day when, as now, its branches would extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and also into foreign countries. The substitution of the Royal Bank of Canada for the Merchants' Bank of Halifax will remove the confusion occasionally caused by the prior existence in our community of the Merchants' Bank of Canada, and, under the management of Mr. Edson L. Pease, to whose energy the rapid growth of the Merchants' Bank has been greatly owing, the Royal Bank of Canada will, we trust, prosper exceedingly.

Yet much as its shareholders and patrons in the Maritime Provinces may rejoice at the birth of the Royal Bank of Canada, there will doubtless be some residents in the old city of Halifax who will regret the disappearance of a name associated with a period of progress and prosperity when the pioneers of the present enterprise made the present venture possible. However, the Royal Bank of Canada is fortunate in having as its President a very worthy representative of the first Board of Directors of the Merchants' Bank of Halifax. Mr. T. E. Kenny was elected President on June 25th, 1870, and has occupied the position ever since, and it is largely owing to his wonderful activity and business ability that the growth of this Halifax bank has led to its transformation into the Royal Bank of Canada.

WAS THE ANNEXATION OF THE ORANGE FREE STATE JUSTIFIED?

The annexation of the Orange Free State by Great Britain has been severely condemned by a distinguished Canadian, who, at the outbreak of the war, when Great Britain took up the gauntlet thrown down by the Transvaal, expressed his sympathy with the Boers. His utterances being universally condemned in Canada, he thought it wise to keep silent until some days ago. The pro-Boer sentiment he gave voice to in the Fall of 1899 again found expression in a very severe censure of England for annexing the Orange Free State. He declared, that it was contrary to the usage of nations for the conqueror to take entire possession of a conquered State. As evidence of this he quoted the case of the Franco-German war when, France being conquered, was only compelled to relinquish possession of the two provinces, Alsace and Lorraine, although her conqueror, Germany, might have annexed the whole of France.

We doubt much the possibility of all France being seized by Germany, but this question is not part of our argument.

The question raised by the censor of England is, whether the annexation of the Orange Free State was or was not in accordance with those historic precedents by which we learn what rights over a conquered State are recognized by national usage? The censor of England plainly infers that England violated such usage. Now, if the constituent parts of modern Empires and nations were to have their independence as States restored which they enjoyed before being compelled to become part of the nation through whose superior power they were incorporated with the Empire or nation of which they now form a part, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland would become, at least, three separate, independent kingdoms. As such precedents may be objected to as too old, we will give modern ones. There was once a Kingdom of Poland, as autonomous and as independent as is England. Where is that nation? It was extinguished by force, because it was a perpetual menace to the peace of central Europe. About a century ago, there was a Republic of Venice, which Napoleon destroyed. Later still there was a Kingdom in north Italy over which the Pope was supreme ruler. In the same land, later still, there was a Kingdom of Naples, and one also of The Two Sicilies. Where are now the great Italian Republic of Venice, and the three kingdoms of the Papal States, Naples and the Two Sicilies? Where too is the Kingdom of Hanover? Here we have a list of no less than five independent States in Europe which have been conquered and absorbed by their conqueror in modern times. We have nothing to say about the equity, morality, or justice of such States being extinguished and annexed. Such questions are not in dispute. The censor of England denies that such political actions are in accordance with the usage of nations, and that the annexation of an entire State by its conqueror is unprecedented. History tells a very different story. Coming closer home we may quote the case of the Southern Confederacy of America. That was an organized State, with a president, an army and other features of an independent Republic. What became of that State? It was crushed by its northern neighbour by force of arms; it was extinguished and forcibly annexed by its conqueror. Yet, with all these precedents, most of them in the memory of the living, we are told that the annexation by England of the Orange Free State is a violation of national usage! So much for the justification of historic precedents. Prior to the war the Orange Free State had not the slightest quarrel with England. The State owed its very existence indeed to England, and was under express obligations not to join in any war movement in association with another State without the formal sanction of England. Yet without any provocation, or excuse, moved only by lust to acquire British territory, the Orange Free