

executive of the Montreal branch had given very careful consideration to this question and had decided that any publicity should be limited to conform to the policy adopted by Chatham House. He proceeded to read the relevant portions of the minutes of the meeting of the executive committee of the Montreal branch which had considered this matter. Considerable discussion followed. Mr. Tom Moore felt that this was a departure from the general policy of the Institute which had depended on the individual members to give publicity, Col. Biggar that it would be unfortunate if the Institute were to take any action which might lead people to believe that it had any views of its own, and Mr. Victor Sifton that if a branch of the Institute were in the habit of coming to decisions on matters of public policy there might be danger of attempts being made by interested parties to a dispute to capture it in order to further their own purposes. Mr. Nelson submitted that the privacy of meetings was very valuable in that it enabled speakers to be frank in what they said. In reply Mr. Savard and Mr. Reading pointed out that the objections which had been raised indicated a misunderstanding of the proposals of the Montreal branch. Mr. Savard therefore requested that a copy of the Montreal proposals be forwarded to the other branches. (1)

2. Programme and Policy for the year 1932-33

a. Banff Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. Burchell sketched the history of the proposals for the Banff conference. The original theme decided on at the close of the China Conference of 1931 had been narrowed down to the subject of "Economic Conflict and Control in the Pacific." The Canadian committee had drawn up a list of data papers, the titles of which he read. If anyone in any community were especially qualified to do one of these data papers he requested that the information should be passed on either to himself or to the secretary. He also pointed out the importance of an early selection of the members of the Canadian delegation so that they might be fully prepared for the conference.

Mr. Bowman expressed himself as ^{being} very pleased that the Committee on which Mr. Burchell had sat had simplified the programme. There was always a tendency for the New York authorities to over-elaborate matters. He hoped for even further simplification at the next meeting of the programme committee. He also hoped that before this conference the delegates would not be deluged with mimeographed papers on subjects which were never discussed at the conference. To this Mr. Moore added the suggestion that it should be clearly indicated which papers sent to the delegates were official. (2)

(1) See Appendix A.

(2) See Appendix B.