

*The Address—Mr. Halliday*

following the presentation of the Speech from the Throne, such as it was, with virtually nothing but tripe in it.

At the same time I recognize the gracious manner in which Her Majesty read the Speech from the Throne, because it must have been equally difficult for her to read that kind of speech, and if the news media are correct, Her Majesty was inconvenienced for some reason beyond my knowledge and had to wear glasses, which she does not normally do. It is typical for this government to make matters awkward and difficult for people whenever it can.

**Mr. Stanfield:** It is difficult to believe.

**Mr. Halliday:** In reviewing and commenting upon the Speech from the Throne, there are a number of things one could discuss. There are items related to the economy, unemployment, inflation, national unity, and the language issue. Hon. members from both sides of the House have dealt very adequately with those subjects; therefore it is not my intention to do so. However, I should like to make one comment with respect to the Speech from the Throne.

I have read the Speech from the Throne a number of times and, as I did so, it became obvious to me that approximately 75 per cent of that speech dealt with the problems of our country with which we are familiar. As well, it dealt with methods the government tried, over the last year or two, in an attempt to correct those problems. For some strange reason, it could only find enough to talk about by way of a remedy for this situation to occupy approximately 25 per cent of the Speech from the Throne.

Traditionally the Speech from the Throne deals with the government's plans for bettering our economy and our national situation. In this instance the government completely failed to do that. The speech contained nothing innovative, and there was nothing new in order to confront our present national problems. Therefore the Speech from the Throne is more notable for what it did not contain, rather than for what it contained.

One particular item it did not contain was a reference to the matters of fitness and amateur sport. Why was there no reference to the matters of fitness and amateur sport in the Speech from the Throne? Is this an insignificant problem in Canada? If that was the case, there would be no minister in charge of that particular portfolio. Perhaps the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his advisers felt the affairs of that minister and that department were not significant and did not merit any reference in the Speech from the Throne. That could be one answer to the question. Another answer—I really doubt if this is the correct one—could be that the minister has no clout in the cabinet. When one observes her inside and outside the House, there is no doubt that she is enthusiastic about her portfolio. I am wondering if she has no clout in the cabinet, just as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) has no clout. That is something of which the people of my constituency are aware.

As the debate on the Speech from the Throne progressed, I was surprised the Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur

[Mr. Halliday.]

Sport (Mrs. Campagnolo) rose to speak in it. Being a member of this House, she was entitled to speak on any topic at all in this type of debate. I wondered why she spoke as the minister and devoted approximately 60 per cent of her speech to her own portfolio and the problems associated with it. I should like to compliment her on her speech. She is a very good orator in her own right and presents her case very well, albeit there were some discrepancies, non sequiturs and flip-flops in her arguments. As a new minister, being only three years in this House, she is probably suffering from some of that contagion which she caught from the Liberals in this government. The contagion I am referring to predisposes them to develop and offer these non sequiturs, flip-flops and so on, which are so characteristic of the present government.

What did the minister have to say in her address? I should preface my remarks by saying that prior to her speaking in this debate she tabled in the House a green paper entitled: "Toward a National Policy on National Sport—A Working Document". To a great extent her speech was an elaboration of her comments contained in this working paper. I should like to refer to the first sentence of her speech, as reported at page 177 of *Hansard* dated October 24, 1977, which reads as follows:

Mr. Speaker, it is not seven years since the last public statement on sport.

I hope the minister was not bragging when she said that. To begin her speech by saying no one in the government has seen fit to make a significant statement on amateur sport in the last three years is a rather reprehensible thing to say about your own government.

In her second sentence she indicated that the green discussion paper had been tabled. She said that it was presented "toward a new national policy on amateur sport". If I asked any Canadian what the present national policy is, I am sure he or she would draw a blank. Somehow she suggested that this was a new policy; but it may well lead to the first government policy of any significance.

● (1522)

One then has to look at some of the comments she made with reference to fitness and amateur sports. She began by saying that there were certain priorities that had to be considered. First she spoke about the spending of the government with regard to health care, and she made much of the fact that in Canada now we are spending roughly \$7 billion a year on health care. Then she said that about 40 per cent of all that money being spent on those aspects of health care related to lifestyle diseases, and she went on to name them:

... such as smoking, use of liquor, the licit and illicit use of drugs, nutritional imbalance and physical exercise that is abandoned, to name only a few.

First of all I want to look at it from different perspectives, the more broad perspective of the total government, and the perspective of the minister, how she perceives the components of her department, namely, fitness on one side and amateur sport on the other, relate to one another in terms of priority. First let us look at it from the perspective of the total government's view of sport and physical fitness. Obviously the