

whole new pool of revenue and funds that they can access. That is a very positive move for Canada and Ontario, particularly southern Ontario.

We have seen improvements in house sales this year. We have seen a tremendous improvement in the bank rate. I have talked about the bank rate as it applies to mortgages for individual consumers in this country, but it is not just those people who benefit by this improvement. A low bank rate helps businesses in this country borrow money, and borrow it on a much better basis.

I should add that there are some very good things going on in Canada. One of the problems we have in this country is that we do not have the courage of our convictions, and that is certainly evidenced by all those on the other side of the House. I would like to give a few examples.

Free trade was supposed to be a terrible thing, at least according to some of the comments made by those in opposition. Yet we are into the third year of the agreement and in March a headline in one of the local papers stated: "Trade figures surge in March as exports hit a record high". A record high is positive.

If we examine those numbers we find that the percentage of manufacturing exports as a part of that total was larger than ever before. In fact, we had a record trade surplus with the United States and record exports to the United States in March.

I do not know where all the doom and gloom that the members opposite are talking about is. Those numbers are very positive and they are very positive for Ontario. Manufacturing was part of that.

It goes even further. Another headline states: "Economy shows modest growth for third month". Another states: "We are moving in the right direction as hard hit manufacturing perks up". Manufacturing in Ontario is starting to see real benefits from what has been done.

They say there are no good signs, but there are many of them. In the Algoma region an article about a company called Great Lakes said: "Great Lakes enjoys a healthy year". The article says that the company is doing all right.

Supply

There is a company in Cambridge that found that Canadians were not prepared to accept its products. Jane Martin went into the manufacturing business and found she had to export up to two-thirds of her products to the United States in order to make the business grow. She was able to do it. She was able to do it very successfully because she stood by her convictions and said: "There is a way to do it and the way to do it is to get on with the job. If Canadians do not want to get on with the job, I will sell my products somewhere else". She did and it worked and the company is very successful. That is one example.

We heard how the textile industry in Canada would be devastated by the free trade agreement, at least that is what those opposite said. A textile manufacturer in Cambridge, a city in Ontario, said: "I agree with the free trade agreement. I think it will be good for my business". Canadians said: "You're wrong, the textile industry will be decimated". What did he do? The chap's name is George Hancock and he put in place new technology and new manufacturing ideas. Lo and behold 1991 was his best year ever. He has increased his exports. He is now selling in the United States, which he did not do before. Twenty-five per cent of the company's \$7 million revenue in 1991 was generated out of exports to the United States.

There are people who are prepared to be very positive, who know how to do it and who are prepared to get off their duff and get it done. That is what we need in this country.

Members may argue that is not constructive. At least that is what the members opposite try to argue. What are the general benefits of this? I happen to have an article from *The International Herald Tribune* on Monday, May 25. It is a U.S. publication distributed world-wide. Its headline is: "Canada sets an example". It is the editorial. I would like to read one paragraph of the editorial because it says exactly what we in this party and government have been saying.

Both Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Bush are conservatives and both resist raising taxes. Mr. Mulroney has attacked his deficit mostly by curbing spending. Canadians have complained loudly and bitterly but they re-elected him in 1988. He has kept the squeeze on, although he will have to run again next year.

There have been real costs—

—and we have all identified them.