

Branch secretaries,

12th September, 1932 (2)

-a- those who are in a position to influence public opinion, and most important those who shape public policy: e.g. men who are influential behind the scenes in politics as well as party leaders and members of legislatures; bankers; industrialists; journalists; trade union leaders; leaders of agrarian and other occupational associations.

-b-(i) those who are experts in international affairs in business, the civil service, and universities, especially those who have been delegates to international conferences called by the League of Nations, the International Labour Office, Chambers of Commerce, the International Trade Unions, etc.

(ii) those whose intelligence and general knowledge fit them to become experts in international affairs;

-c- a smaller number of younger men of promise whom it is hoped will graduate in time to classes (a) and (b). The Toronto branch has for some years made such men associate members and charged them no subscription fee. It is now proposed to charge them \$2.00 per annum and to invite them to general meetings and groups at the discretion of the executive. This associate membership is said to serve two useful purposes: it has enabled the branch to take advantage of the services of some younger men who were not in a position to pay the annual subscription of \$10.00 and it has provided a probationary period during which it becomes evident whether the associate member were entitled to full membership. Toronto proposes this year to invite the executives of the Foreign Affairs Club and the Historical Club of the university to some meetings.

Do you agree that these three classes of member represent those who are most valuable? If not, what other classes should be included? Is the Toronto suggestion about the establishment of an associate membership appropriate only to a university town, if appropriate there?

3. Publicity (1-b, paragraph 2, and Appendix A).

Do you agree with the proposals of the Montreal branch on publicity? Do they serve the purpose mentioned by Mr. Savard of bringing the Canadian Institute and its work to the attention of those who would be desirable members? Do they serve any other useful purpose such as the building up of an informed public opinion? Are the adverse criticisms made at the Ottawa meeting valid when levelled against the proposals in their amended form as given in Appendix A? And in particular is it not correct that the publicity desired by the Montreal branch - whatever its value - is even more restricted than that encouraged by Chatham House, e.g. the Montreal branch wishes to publish notices but not reports of meetings while Chatham House publishes reports of certain meetings in its journal "International Affairs" which is open to public subscription. Is it perhaps desirable for