need the training and who are eligible to qualify. Sometimes trainees are not permitted to train for long enough. We must remember that over 40 per cent of our labour force is not educated to grade 8 level. Department of Manpower regulations state that you can only take 52 weeks training at any one time, plus an additional 52 weeks of training in skills.

Here is the catch, Mr. Speaker. Say the trainee starts at the grade 5 level. He takes 12 weeks for each grade and at the end of 48 weeks he has completed his education up to and including the grade 8 level. In no way can he complete grade 9. He has only four weeks left, and he cannot complete grade 10. He cannot go on to take a highly skilled course because he has not the academic background or the knowledge to master that course; and there that trainee is. He therefore has to wait for another term. What an inflexible, bureaucratic, discriminatory rule that is, Mr. Speaker. It is frustrating and cruel for the person involved and is a wanton waste of the taxpayer's money.

The trainee has trained hard for 48 weeks. He has cost the federal taxpayer—and who is not a federal taxpayer—$7 a day for training, or $2,000 for his education alone. He will only have reached the grade 8 level, which is nowhere. If he is single, he will have drawn $43 a week; so that for the total time he has spent training he will have cost the taxpayer around $4,000. If he is married, with four dependants, he will have drawn $88 per week. In a year we spend over $300 million on these courses. I have checked into this and according to figures I was given this year we are to spend around $320 million on these courses.

● (10:10 p.m.)

The way to correct this colossal blunder lies in allowing the trainee to continue until he has finished grade 10, if he is going into a skilled trade, then letting him complete his training in skills before getting him back to work. As it is, he finds himself turned out at grade 8 level without a job. Does he go on welfare, waiting until he can register again and, hopefully, complete grades 9 and 10 so that he can then learn the skills required? This is very likely.

The Canada Manpower centres and the local educational facilities operate in an administrative vacuum. There is little or no constructive consultation as to the real needs of students or the best way of spending the taxpayers' money. This is the way the federal government wants it—bureaucratic control from the top. Instead of using the judgment of the local Manpower centres—in my constituency, and I am sure this applies generally, they are staffed with smart, intelligent people who will strive to help these trainees—the federal government prefers to exercise rigid bureaucratic control. The same applies to the teachers. Give them more elbow room in which to operate, and we would see a real improvement in the results. But Ottawa allows them no power within the rigid framework provided.

No leeway is allowed to the teacher to help the trainee along in the best way for the individual concerned; and

24081—21

if it is best for him, it is probably best for the taxpayer. Ottawa must make even the minor decisions. No provision is made for the student who could complete the course in less than the normal period. All must work at the same rate. No provision is made for the talented academic student who might wish to go on to grade 13, either by Manpower or by the provincial boards of education.

I trust I have drawn attention to some of the flaws in the system as well as ways in which a remedy might be found. Many of the problems and shortcomings attached to the retraining program have been outlined in briefs to the department and others. I have drawn attention to some of them in the short time available to me. I am sure the minister is aware of these serious shortcomings and, hopefully, he realizes they must be overcome in order that the $323 million we are spending on the program may not be spent in vain but will bring satisfaction to both the trainees and the taxpayers.

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, it is a pity that the hon. member should have displayed such colossal ignorance of the social benefits which have accrued by virtue of the Manpower training program. It is true there are occasions when individual cases are handled in a manner which leaves something to be desired, but to draw from those cases such a sweeping conclusion in the terms the hon. member adopted tonight amounts to displaying a very limited knowledge of the entire subject.

The whole question of the education of adults is a difficult one. It requires, of course, flexibility and sensibility, and we certainly welcome suggestions and criticisms from members of this House, advanced—

Mr. Rynard: Don't speak about colossal ignorance, then.

Mr. Caccia: —without attempting to accuse the Manpower retraining effort of being a colossal blunder, as the hon. member did. Of course, the object of the educational upgrading courses is not to provide the equivalent of a primary or high school diploma or to facilitate entry into university. It is to provide the essentials of the mathematics, science and communications required to enable an adult to enter a skill training course or move directly into a job. A great deal of such upgrading can be accomplished in 52 weeks. It is common in most provinces to take an adult from functional illiteracy up to the completion of primary level, or from primary level up to the grade 10 level well within this limit. Moreover, experimental programs now under way may enable an adult to move through the equivalent of grades 1 to 10 within 52 weeks.

Modifications in the limits on the duration of training, with a view to providing flexibility if and when required, have been considered. These possible modifications raise questions such as: What larger proportion of available training resources would be devoted to serving relatively fewer trainees? What effect might the elimination or extension of the limits on training have on the incentive