with a new set of criteria. Before, it was more or less a Member's discretionary fund which he could use to subsidize in his riding what had to be non-profit organizations. He could subsidize these directly, and often did so without first requesting a feasibility study. Now, however, the new criteria that were announced by the Minister, the Hon. Member for Berthier—Maskinongé—Lanaudière (Mr. de Cotret) in Louiseville, have been a great incentive for businessmen in the riding to submit projects. These are major projects, by the way. For the Laprade Fund, projects must be worth $500,000 or more. The projects must create permanent jobs, and since the announcement a year ago that the Laprade Fund would be reactivated with very specific acceptance criteria, I have had at least ten proposals that are either being analyzed or are about to be announced. At least three or four of these have already been announced, and they would not have materialized without the Laprade Fund. And consider that originally, the Laprade Fund could only be used for non-profit organizations—not for the private sector and not for municipalities!

If we want permanent jobs, doesn't it make sense to look to the private sector and our municipalities, to major projects like establishing museums or other initiatives? That is what the Laprade Fund did for the Hon. Member for Trois-Rivières, and there was a positive impact, not just on the Hon. Member's riding and my own, but on all ridings in the region, and it was greatly appreciated by the private sector. Earlier, the Hon. Member wondered whether previous budgets had had an impact, and whether this one was pointing us in the same direction. Yes indeed. When the first budgets were brought down . . . The Government's initial economic proposals were announced a few months after the 1984 election, and the impact was already being felt in the riding of Richelieu at the time. This was reflected in the creation of new jobs, a drop in the unemployment rate, new investment, exports and new construction.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Resuming debate. The Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon).

• (1240)

[*English*]

Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor): Madam Speaker, I want to make it clear from the start of this speech that the Government has had its successes. I am interested to see that the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Bouchard) is present. The Government has had its successes in cleaning up a situation in which jobs were provided through the Department of Employment on a short term *ad hoc* basis which did very little good for the people in terms of placing them in positions where they could have longer term jobs for the future.

There have been successes in some areas of foreign policy. For instance, the Government's policy on Central America, although it might not be quite as outspoken as I would wish it to be, has been very much on the right side in a difficult situation.

There are many who would say that the Meech Lake Accord is very much an area of success.

I also have to say, especially with respect to economic policy, that the Government has had its failures. As I see it, its failures have come especially in industrial policy. There have been three Ministers in the space of 3.5 years, one who has been judged to have been involved in 14 conflicts of interest by Judge Parker, another who has been dismissed from the Cabinet, and a third who is now in front of us. Those three Ministers are perhaps part of the reason that we have not had an industrial policy from the Government as part of its broad economic policy which has been effective.

Mr. Edwards: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think that it would be appropriate if the Hon. Member is making an accusation that he be specific.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Chair was listening very carefully to the Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor (Mr. Langdon) and wondering at what point he could make some relation to the subject which is being studied today while making accusations or allegations. I am sure that the Hon. Member will want to be very careful when he is discussing the subject at hand. The Hon. Member for Essex—Windsor.

Mr. Langdon: I am not here to discuss the activities of the past Minister of industry, the Member for York—Peel (Mr. Stevens)—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): The Chair thinks that, if the Hon. Member is not here to discuss the activities of other Members, then he should not do so.

Mr. Langdon: I appreciate that, Madam Speaker, but one of the points I am making, which is very important with respect to what I see as a profound failure of this Government in its industrial policy in terms of consistency and direction, is that it has had three Ministers in the space of three and a half years. We all know in the House that that is the result of certain events which took place affecting one of those Ministers of Regional Industrial Expansion. As I say, that is not the subject of my speech. The subject of my speech is the failure of industrial policy of the Government.

Mr. Edwards: Madam Speaker, I think that the Hon. Member is seeking to do, as Anthony did, through omittendo what his Party has failed to do through innuendo.

Mr. Langdon: I must say, with due respect to the Member, that this is absolute nonsense. I am simply reporting what has taken place, and what everyone in the House knows has taken place, which has created the situation where we have had three Ministers of Regional Industrial Expansion. My point is that the takeovers which have taken place within the Ministry have