we will not get into that. However, I would like to continue with my points here.

It is very clear, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. de Jong: It is not an opportunity for you to make a 10-minute speech.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I suggest that the hon. member end his remarks because other members want to make comments or questions.

Mr. Pickard: The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, and I am certain that my colleague from Windsor-St. Clair has the same viewpoints because we did go through Essex and Kent counties listening to the drastic concerns that are there, heard the welfare people suggest strongly that there is absolutely no question that the federal government has dumped upon the communities with regard to Bill C-21, with the welfare rolls doubling in one year, with job losses dramatically increasing—

Mr. McCurdy: Mr. Speaker, I must congratulate my colleague for giving such insightful reinforcement to what I had already said. He said, I think, that there has been considerable job loss. There has been considerable job loss in Windsor, but what he did not say was that the status of research and development in Ottawa is of significance even in Windsor.

I just wanted the Speaker to know, because I think he would want to be informed, as I am sure my hon. colleague on the Liberal side would want to know, that I received information just today with respect to NRC that 400 scientists have applied for early retirement, the deadline being tomorrow.

Now what you have got to understand is that that is 400 out of only 3,000, roughly 15 per cent of the scientists at NRC. What that means is that this government has caused such a deterioration of morale at NRC that it has become a sinking ship and its crew are trying to get life-jackets as fast as they possibly can, and that is a reflection of this government's policy with respect to research and development.

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle): A very short question, Mr. Speaker. In the New Democratic Party we do not need to deliver 10-minute speeches in order to get to the question.

The question I would like to pose to the hon. member concerns as well the Liberal record because he did point out in his speech some of the omissions and sins of the previous regime. I think it is important to point these out, not in terms of any sense of forgiveness of what this government has done, but certainly the hon. member will remember the scientific research tax credit scheme that the Liberals introduced in their dying days.

I wonder if my colleague could comment on that type of expenditure of where the government, under Mr. Lalonde at that time, threw these vast amounts of money supposedly at research and development but, of course, it ended up in the pockets of lawyers and in the pockets of accountants and very little of it actually did occur in actual research.

Mr. McCurdy: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to that. I mentioned that when Pierre Trudeau took office in 1968, the GERD: GDP ratio was 1.4 per cent and it then plunged to .9 per cent.

It is important to note that the Lamontagne report, quite some time ago in the 1970s, suggested then that a GERD target of 2.5 per cent be established and accomplished. It is worth noting, for example, that between 1970 and 1977, Liberal science spending fell from $980 million to just a little over $900 million.

It was in 1977 that the Liberal government abandoned the 50/50 split for transfers to fund universities. It is notable that they were responsible for the six and five arrangement, having cost the system about $2 billion by its own action.

It is also useful to point out that some of the economic policies that the Liberals implemented during the 1970s, if the money had been used as investment for research and development and industrial technological development, we probably would not be in the situation we are in now.

Mr. René Soetens (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to participate in this particular debate today.

I note that it is moved by the hon. member for Willowdale. I happened to be in Willowdale about 10 days ago and if I presented the motion to the people that I talked to, a group of people concerned about the economics, et cetera, of the country, they would wonder where this member came up with this idea because it certainly does not reflect their opinion, and all the people I talked to were his constituents.