

Adjournment Debate

final effrontery to bring in a Bill that pretends to somehow support that sector. In case anybody is in doubt, Madam Speaker, I shall not be voting for this legislation.

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): If I may, Madam Speaker, I would like to enter this debate, particularly in respect to Motion No. 3 proposed by my colleague, the Hon. Member for St. Catharines (Mr. Reid).

One thing that must be made very clear when considering the suggestion to have something specific with respect to the city of Calgary is that the Government really has no business getting into the field it is proposing to get into. It has been pointed out that the Government is suggesting the Canadian public should enter into a terribly unfair gamble. For example, it has been estimated that in respect to the Wintario lottery in Ontario, there is one chance in 1,400,000 of winning one of the five prizes of \$100,000. The reason I point that out, as the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox) has indicated, is that this is not a partisan matter, it is simply a question of the federal Government being honest with the Canadian public.

The truth is that lotteries return a mere 38 per cent to 40 per cent of the total moneys that are paid mainly by the poor of the country. Conventional betting games offer far more appealing odds if one is looking for a gamble. For example, roulette on average returns about 95 per cent of the bettor's money. Horse racing returns about 82 per cent, black jack 94 per cent and a game of dice 83 per cent to 97 per cent. One of the worst gambles you can ask anyone to go into is the type of lottery that the Government proposes. We must ask why the Government would want to be so unfair, especially with the poor of the country. Clearly it is doing this at the behest of its advertising agency friends. It is a massive pay-off because the people who make the biggest money out of this type of promotion are the advertising agencies.

Madam Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member.

Mr. Stevens: May I call it eleven o'clock, Madam Speaker?

Nor did the Civil Service ask for the evacuation. The Civil Service was certainly more knowledgeable than the politicians of the day. Nor did the RCMP who conducted investigations ask for it. No acts of sabotage were carried out, there was no espionage and no evidence that any was planned.

Japanese-Canadians even volunteered for military service and some actually served. Ken Adachi's book is truly titled "The Enemy That never Was". The pressure, unfortunately, was political. There was an appeal by unscrupulous politicians to racial hatred and fear on the part of white British Columbians. It is part of long-standing prejudices and was seen in the period before the war in the denial of full citizenship rights to orientals throughout the 1930s, especially the right to vote.

There never was any need for the evacuation and that it was motivated by prejudice can readily be seen in the treatment of Japanese Canadians after the war. For purposes of immigration Germans were put on the same basis as other Europeans in 1950, while in 1952 the Japanese were still treated as enemy aliens. The enfranchisement of Japanese Canadians occurred only in 1948. Wartime controls on Canadians of Japanese origin were kept on until 1949 so Canadians of Japanese origin were required to carry a permit from the RCMP to visit B.C. Some went to jail for not having a permit. Interned people were not allowed back to B.C. for years, and even later were not allowed to have their fishing permits back.

A scandal erupted on the issue of deportation of people who had requested repatriation to Japan. It was later found that the requests were often never understood. Some were coerced and wives and dependents were included in the deportation. Fortunately, deportation orders were eventually abandoned. As late as April 1947 a CCF motion in the House of Commons was defeated 105 to 31 to remove all restrictions on Japanese Canadians. Only four Liberals and two Conservatives voted with the CCF.

This might be the time to pay tribute to my predecessors in the CCF for their courageous work in fighting against prejudice and for fair treatment. There was Angus MacInnis, J. S. Woodsworth and Andrew Brewin of Greenwood who was prominent in the compensation issue and the fight against deportation after the war.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) has made reference to the Royal Commission on Compensation for Japanese Canadians. I should like to note that the compensation provided was only partial. More than 22,000 people were uprooted and moved across Canada, yet there were only 1,434 claims. Estimates are that people received only one-third of the value of their loss. Claims were made for more than \$7 million but only \$2.5 million was paid. Some claimants received as little as \$50. It was not possible for many people, upon their return, to take up the life they had left behind. They could not buy back their houses and boats or the property they had been forced to sell. The compensation did not take into account inflation, loss of wages, salaries or profits let alone the suffering and humiliation.

• (2300)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

HUMAN RIGHTS—INTERNMENT OF JAPANESE-CANADIANS—
PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION. (B) FORM OF COMPENSATION

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood): Madam Speaker, the injustices done to Canadians of Japanese ancestry in Canada in 1942 in the evacuation, internment and confiscation of property, it need hardly be argued today, ought never to have happened. There was never any military reason for this kind of action and no pressure from the military authorities.