

which have been found popular and attractive are that, they allow the holders to travel or reside in any part of the world, they are also non-forfeitable, claims are paid promptly, and army and navy policies are issued in time of peace without extra premiums. These with the participation in profits above referred to, have been of service in expanding the business of the London & Lancashire and retaining what has been secured.

LIFE VERSUS FIRE INSURANCE.

On Tuesday night last, the members of the Insurance Institute of Montreal, with a few invited guests, assembled to hear a debate on this thesis:—

"Resolved; That Life Assurance has conferred greater benefit upon the community generally, during the past century, than has Fire Insurance."

The chair was filled, in more than a metaphorical sense, by Mr. E. L. Bond, with whom were associated, to decide the merits of the debate, Professor Rutan of McGill University, and Mr. Martin, advocate. The hall of the Natural History Society, where the discussion took place, was filled by a highly appreciative audience, who gave the speakers on both sides not only an attentive hearing but impartial applause, when any point was made. The debate was opened on behalf of the affirmative by Mr. B. Hal Brown, manager of the London & Lancashire, who laid stress upon the superior value of life compared to that of property, from which he developed an argument in support of life assurance being more beneficial than that of fire. Mr. B. Grigg, B. A., of the Sun Life of Canada, put his trust mainly on the "acuteness," or, we may say, the urgency of a man's wants being the measure of the value of what is offered to supply them. Priceless pearls found by one dying of thirst are of no value compared to a cup of water. From this was inferred that, as life assurance meets a human need in its acutest form, as a provision for the destitute bereaved, it is of more benefit to the community than fire insurance, which relieves no such calamity. Mr. Dodds, of the Mutual Life, dwelt also on the beneficent services of life insurance. These speakers were followed respectively by a fire insurance champion. Mr. Morrissey, manager of the Union Fire, who took the lead for fire insurance, "brought down the house" by flashes of satirical humour. He has the makings of an effective platform speaker. He, however, took up so much time by an eloquent description of the scene incident to a large fire that he had to retire before the argument was started which this was intended to enforce. Indeed, throughout the debate, the speakers were all called down by the time limit, which was altogether too short. When developing their case, their argumentative buds were blighted by the chairman's bell before they burst into flower. Mr. Pemberton Smith, of the Guardian Fire, and Mr. Fromings, of the Aetna Fire, emphasized the value of fire insurance as

a protection to the mercantile community. They affirmed that a marvellous development had occurred since fire insurance was established, the latter of which they regarded as a consequence of the former. The argument "post hoc propter hoc," is, however, double edged. New trade developments may have created new trade needs, one of which might be said to be insurance of property against fire. But, as to fire insurance being a powerful ally of commerce, and, therefore, of great benefit to the community, generally there can be no question. They also dwelt upon the advantages to the community of a large body of permanent officials being engaged in the fire business; on the benefits of having property owners instructed on fire protection, and the financial benefits arising from the investments of the fire insurance companies. A considerable portion of the time of each speaker, on both sides, was lost in introductory remarks, owing to their being unpractised in the art of debate. Time was also occasionally wasted in criticising the methods of conducting insurance business, which is quite outside the subject under discussion. It would be an invidious task to discriminate between the reasoning abilities of the several champions, or to endeavour to duly distribute praise for effectiveness in argument, or blame for avoiding the question at issue, or, not replying to the preceding speakers. The judges decided in favour of the champions of Life Assurance by two to one.

Debating is an art which is not learnt in a day, even in the House of Commons, Ottawa, as well as at Westminster, the number of debaters is very limited. The practice of public discussion, when the subject to be debated is carefully studied by reading leading authorities and reflection, is exceedingly instructive, as well as a most healthful mental stimulus and exercise. Young men need to have some object in view in reading literature in order to derive intellectual nutriment therefrom. A series of debates under the auspices of the Insurance Institute of Montreal will be of great benefit to those who share in and those who intelligently follow the discussions. Future debates on current matters, more especially such as relate to insurance, ought to be encouraged and those who inaugurated this movement deserve commendation.

MESSRS. FETHERSTONHAUGH & Co., Patent Solicitors, Canada Life Building, furnish us with the following complete weekly list of patents granted to Canadians in the following countries. Any further information may be readily obtained from them direct. Canadian patents.—A. McPhee, nut locks; A. Mahlitz, neck yokes; A. Drouillard, ventilating devices; C. Nebelung, devices for stretching fur garments; J. A. Parsons, hats; J. Muir, endless reels for harvester binders; R. N. Moore, mechanical toys. American patents.—T. Barons, jaw member for hoof cutters; C. E. Bartholomew, telephone desk; E. E. Bartlett, warp rest for looms; J. H. Beamer, fabric; H. Bergeron, means for utilizing space in crowded municipalities; E. F. Comber, lock bolt; W. Jennings, tire fastener; R. Smith, screen plate for paper making machines.