

including the interests of Canadian fishermen, would suffer dramatically.

He knows that and he should stop trying to make dramatic headlines on the floor of the House of Commons at the expense of the Canadian fishing industry.

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning, while MPs were attending caucus, five licences were issued, four to Moscow and one to Havana, to catch 12,265 tonnes of fish in the northern codstock zone, including redfish and a by-catch of cod and turbot on the Labrador coast, enough to keep a Canadian fish plant going for an entire year.

Does the Secretary of State for External Affairs realize that the Moscow licences permit 1,000 tonnes of northern cod as a by-catch and three million pounds of redfish in 2-J and 3-K, the very fish in the very zone in which we have to cut back? The fishermen want to know what Moscow and Havana have that Fogo, Twillingate and Moreton's Harbour do not have. This is the Canadian government, not the United Nations.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, this is also not the OK Corral.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** This is a country which, under Liberal governments and Conservative governments, has sought to live by and to enlarge the ambit of international law and international understanding.

I do know about the implications of Soviet fishing here. I do know that for the first time ever the U.S.S.R. has agreed to deliver in 1990 their by-catches for processing at Canadian fish plants.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** I do know that the U.S.S.R. presence in Canadian water also provides us with about \$13 million worth of economic benefits. I think it is more in the interests of Canada to take advantage of those real benefits than to try to score points by attacking Cuba or Moscow.

### *Oral Questions*

#### **ARMED FORCES ADVERTISING**

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—St. Clair):** Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Associate Minister of National Defence who has condemned her department for its offensive, stereotyped, portrayal of women.

I have two more examples so outrageous that they must represent a deliberate rejection of the federal guidelines. One ad of the Canadian Armed Forces portrays an Afro-Canadian, dressed in civilian clothing, acting as a chauffeur for three white soldiers, including one woman. Another portrays an oriental, dressed as a chef, operating a radio among three uniformed soldiers.

Is that the level of participation that is expected of visible minorities in the Canadian Armed Forces? Is it that their positions should be subservient? Will the minister act to discipline those responsible and bring a halt to it?

**Hon. Mary Collins (Associate Minister of National Defence and Minister responsible for Status of Women):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member I think already knows, when these ads were brought to my attention I was very annoyed with them, as I am sure he can imagine. They have been cancelled and we have put in place new measures to ensure that in future such advertising will be reviewed at a higher level to give a broader perspective on such advertising.

• (1440 )

I would like to say as well that the purpose of the advertising campaign was to show that anyone in Canadian society could be interested in a career as a part-time reservist in the militia, and to show that women and minority groups form part of our reserves. Obviously the method that was used to try to portray that was inappropriate. It has been stopped and I will ensure that it does not happen again.

\* \* \*

#### **FUNDING FOR WOMEN'S CENTRES**

**Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East):** My supplementary question is for the Secretary of State. Once again this government has shown its contempt for women. The minister's office has confirmed that region-