

**Hon. Francis Fox (Secretary of State and Minister of Communications):** Madam Speaker, there are applications pending in both Canada and the United States. In the case of Canada, it is for a registered certification mark. In the United States, an application for trade mark is proceeding. As I understand it, Canadian Patents and Development Limited has filed lengthy patent applications in both countries.

It is not patent protection as such which is the main advantage for Canadian industry. In many cases the Telidon system can be described as being the state of the art. It is a question of know-how. In many cases these questions cannot be protected by patents.

In the case of Telidon the Canadian industry has benefited from an advance of approximately one year over its competitors in other countries. No one really believes that this system cannot be duplicated or that it cannot be processed in other countries. At the moment Canadians have a 12-month lead over their competitors which is due in good part to the policies adopted by the government.

\* \* \*

## THE CONSTITUTION

### RECOGNITION OF MUNICIPALITIES AS GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES

**Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Public Works. In a speech last week in Regina to the urban municipalities of Canada, the minister decried the fact that the municipalities were not recognized as legal governmental entities in the new constitutional proposals of the government. Was that proposition discussed in cabinet? Was the minister expressing government policy, namely, that municipal governments should be recognized as a third level of government within the Canadian Constitution?

**Hon. Paul J. Cosgrove (Minister of Public Works):** Madam Speaker, I indicated at the meeting of the Canadian Federation of Municipalities that hopefully, with the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada on the Constitution soon, the issue of continued negotiations between the provinces and the federal government, which is called for in the resolution passed and forwarded by the House, and the issue of the relationships of all governments, would no doubt be a matter for agenda between the federal government and the provinces in the near future.

In doing so I felt with some confidence that I reflected, in so far as the municipalities are concerned, the view of one in three members of the House of Commons who at one time or another held elective office at the local level. I am sure those members, together with many others in the House, agree that a very significant role is played by local governments in the scheme of governmental activity in Canada and that they should be a part of the discussion on a future governmental scheme for Canada.

## Oral Questions

### FUTURE STATUS OF MUNICIPALITIES

**Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher):** Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Right Hon. Prime Minister. Those of us who have held positions in municipal governments feel that there must be ongoing dialogue and a position for municipalities, but obviously this matter must be discussed between the federal government and the provinces. The municipalities are subject to provincial legislation and provincial governments. Is it the policy of the government, as expressed by the minister, that the federal government will advocate at future conferences with the provinces that municipalities should be recognized as legal entities within the Canadian Constitution?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, this question has been raised several times with many of my ministers and myself. We have taken the position generally taken by the hon. minister. We agree that under the present Constitution it is a matter under provincial jurisdiction, and that any change in it would have to be the result of consultation.

We think there is a significant array of arguments for giving the municipalities status under the Constitution. Of course this must be discussed with the provinces. We feel the discussion will come at some time or other when we get to discussing the division of powers. We have no actual plans to begin that discussion now, but I think the municipalities have every right and that the ministers have every occasion to support them when they say they want to be recognized as significant entities.

You will recall, Madam Speaker, that when the House was asking that at the constitutional conference last September we bring in representatives of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, we pointed out in the House that the municipalities were also elected and that they represented people. Therefore we posed the problem in much the same terms as the minister.

\* \* \*

## NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

### INVESTMENT IN MAJOR PROJECTS

**Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. On May 28, 1981, Hon. Bud Olson, the Minister of State for Economic Development, said that the federal government envisaged the need for major investments in a northern transportation system and in hydro power generation. Could the minister indicate to which specific projects in the field of transportation—which roads, railway, harbours and pipelines—was the Minister of State for Economic Development referring and, similarly, to which hydro projects?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Madam Speaker, if the hon. member wishes some indication of what priorities there are in terms of