Plant Breeders' Rights

legislation. However, as I listened to the Hon. Member from Lethbridge he started out by giving us an interpretation of Canadian history which is fundamentally flawed. He said that the way we built this country was only through individual enterprise, through the exercise of private property and entrepreneurs taking risks—the whole Conservative mythology about how Canada came into being.

The fact of the matter is that that is not how the country came into being at all. If one wants to be an advocate of that particular view of private property, and how economic activity is generated, and how particular countries have been built, then that is fine. However, do not distort Canadian history in order to make the case. The fact of the matter is that the country developed as a result of a very creative mix of both public money and political vision and private property and private investment, the CPR being an example thereof, as well as Canadian institutions, Crown corporations and other things we have come to see as part and parcel of the fabric of the country, like the Canadian Wheat Board for example. These do not conform to the Tory mythology about how Canada was built.

They are making a serious error when they get up and try to lead us to believe that that is how the country came into being. They may want to take the country in a particular direction—that is fine. It is their right to argue for that direction. It is the right of the Government to bring in legislation which takes us in that direction. However, please do not pretend that this is perfectly in keeping with Canadian history because Canadian history is something else all together.

Our argument on this side is that the public sector, whether it be in the form of Crown corporations or in the form of research done by universities and government Departments, have played a vital role in making us the kind of country that we are today. Many of the victories that we have won in the agricultural sector, whether it is the more recent one concerning canola or whether it is other former victories with respect to the development of various kinds of wheat, are things that happened because there was a public commitment to this kind of research and because the results of that research were made widely available. All this happened without the desire for profit that the Hon. Member from Lethbridge

says is so absolutely indispensable to anything good happening.

The fact of the matter is that societies can do good, productive and creative things without being motivated purely by money. I know that goes against the Conservative view of the world. The fact is that many good things have happened in this country without that kind of motivation. What we are saying is that we would like to preserve the mix of public and private, of things still being done for the good of the country or for the good of agriculture, or as the case may be.

The Member from Lethbridge says that we do not want to enter the modern world, that the NDP wants to keep the country back from modernity. If the kind of modernity that the Conservatives want us to enter into is a world in which everything is motivated only by the desire for profit, in which everything is regulated by the market-place, then, yes, that is the kind of world that we do not want to enter into and that we do not want our country to enter into. Unfortunately, that is the way of the world. The Member from Lethbridge is right about that. The question is whether or not in Canada we are going to acquiesce to these global trends, whether we are going to have what I would call an accomodationist stance toward these global trends, or whether we are going to, in concert with other countries, resist these global trends.

It may be difficult to do this. It is going to be particularly difficult for us to do this after the Free Trade Agreement because the Free Trade Agreement for many of us is the symbol of Canada giving up on that tension between public and private, giving up on a mixed economy, giving up on what has made Canada a particularly successful country.

I think members of the Government should remember that the kind of country that we have is not the kind of country that has been created only by individual enterprise. It is the kind of country that has been created by this creative mix of the public and private sector. What they have done through their actions in the Free Trade Agreement and through this action, and through many other acts that they have taken and some that they still plan to take, has broken that tension. From here on in it is the market–place alone. If that is the kind of brave new world that the Government wants to lead us into,