

the election of the Newfoundland legislature could probably be completed before freeze-up.

6. *A late autumn session of Parliament, say November 15th.* This would have the advantage that the details of union could be more carefully worked out. On the other hand, it would entail a winter election at least for members of Parliament if Newfoundland was to be represented in Parliament next session, which would be highly desirable. Whether or not a provincial election would be necessary might be left to the decision of the Newfoundland Government. A target date of say, January 1st, might be taken as the date of union. It is possible that such a date might not seem to Newfoundlanders to be unduly long and might not give rise to undue discontent or uncertainty, provided of course announcement of this as a probable date of union could be made shortly after the referendum.

7. *Action by Parliament next winter, union to become effective say March 31st or July 1st, 1949.* This might seem to be the most satisfactory course from the standpoint of the convenience of the Canadian Government but it would have serious disadvantages. Prolonged delay in effecting union might very easily give rise to very serious adverse economic conditions in Newfoundland. If so, the tradition that confederation was accompanied by adverse economic conditions might very well develop in Newfoundland, as it did in Nova Scotia. Undue delay would also very probably give rise to serious discontent among the Newfoundland electorate. Adverse business conditions prior to union might seriously weaken Newfoundland's financial position and the Canadian Government might find it politically necessary to meet provincial deficits which might, at any rate, popularly, be said to have arisen because of the delay of the Canadian Government in completing the union.

SUGGESTIONS

8. The Governor of Newfoundland and a Commissioner are scheduled to fly to England today (June 21st) to discuss the whole situation with the United Kingdom Government and to work out alternative plans in anticipation of a referendum on July 22nd. Discussions will no doubt in part be concerned with the programme in the event of a favourable vote for responsible government, but in part they will be concerned with procedure in the event of a favourable vote for Confederation. The Governor seems determined to avoid any blame for delay in effecting union, should Confederation win. We may thus be faced with the question as to how soon we think union could be made effective, assuming a favourable vote. But whether or not we are asked this question, it would seem unwise to let the United Kingdom Government and the Commission of Government make plans which would, in fact, be prejudiced by an undisclosed timetable on our part. It is suggested, therefore that a decision should be taken as to which of the above alternatives, examined in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, would seem to be most practicable from the Canadian standpoint and that the United Kingdom should be so informed. It is obvious that the United Kingdom and Canadian action in this matter should be synchronized in time as well as in substance, and that the closest liaison should be maintained so that a favourable vote for Confederation would not find either Government unprepared for the next steps. It may be that the necessary liaison could be maintained at Canada House or that certain Canadian officials (say Mr. MacKay and Mr. Mitchell Sharp) might