

jurisdictions, such as the environment, we have a duty to work together in the common interest.

Sixth, we are prepared to consider any and all arrangements that have the effect of moving decision-making closer to the people and involving people in the decision-making process itself.

Finally, we must safeguard the rights of all Canadians. It is enough that we already have one notwithstanding clause in the Charter, we will have no more.

In any constitutional discussions, the Government of Canada will not be a referee. Vital interests are at stake and the federal government will be playing a strong and vigorous role in defending them.

Our Constitution should not be seen as cast in stone. The Constitution should be made to fit the country and not the country made to fit the Constitution. And for the good of the country, change is needed.

Premier Wells responded positively to the Prime Minister's speech. He said:

"I welcome the leadership that he is giving in taking this position across the country...."

The Premier's support for the Prime Minister's efforts is appreciated, but I am concerned that the possibility of a divided nation is one that the Premier seems to accept with remarkable equanimity. As Mr. Wells recently said:

"If we cannot agree on a compromise [with Quebec], then I can only assume that we're going to end up as two countries."

This prospect doesn't seem particularly troubling to Mr. Wells now, just as it did not in the fateful weeks of last June.

And it appears that many people in Newfoundland believe that if Quebec separates it will make no difference. Some people even believe that Newfoundland would be better off in a Canada without Quebec. A few call openly for Quebec to leave.

As Peter Boswell recently wrote:

"[P]erhaps the greatest contribution Quebec could now make is for it to separate as quickly as possible and to let the rest of Canada get on with building a prosperous and united country."