Criminal Code many times since we have become the government. I think all the changes were in the right direction. We were not tied into a process whereby we were waiting five years and then one year for the parliamentary committee to report and then having the government seized with making changes.

I would ask the House to turn this amendment down.

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants): Mr. Speaker, I will just make a very short comment on this amendment because I think a couple of other members want to speak.

I know the parliamentary secretary wants to move the matter along. Quite frankly I may surprise the parliamentary secretary because my objection to the amendment really was the five-year period. I have the greatest respect for the member for Halifax who moved the amendment for the member for Moncton.

I was involved in legislation when I sat on the other side where there were review procedures under the National Transportation Act. I think it was three years. I was bothered by the five-year period. I listened quite seriously to the parliamentary secretary. I frankly think he makes a good case.

• (1150)

It is a new bill. I commend the member from Westminster who the member for Winnipeg Transcona mentioned. I was here when she introduced her private member's bill. I have concern as other members have mentioned—she certainly did in her thoughtful speech—about this legislation because there were some serious issues involved in it.

Other interest groups outside the House have raised serious questions but I tend to agree with the parliamentary secretary. We know there is an issue. All members want to try to resolve this horror of stalking people, basically women. I am not talking about children; they are stalked too.

There is not a member in the House who has not had some constituent in that type of situation. There is no doubt about it. We cannot get away from it. We try to equalize everything. There is emancipation of men and women. The fact of the matter is that with the law of the land and the way women are treated unfortunately by some men they are still at a very real disadvantage in many ways.

Will the bill meet all the problems? Obviously there will still be some horrors occurring in our streets, towns and cities, but at least the bill is trying to address the problem.

I do feel a five-year review could very well be an impediment. I would hope the new government after the next election will be watching this matter. I do not think we will wait for the Supreme Court of Canada to decide five years down the road that it is an interesting time to review it. I tend to share the views of the parliamentary secretary.

Just briefly on the Young Offenders Act which is also included in the bill, I tell the House I have just had a questionnaire returned. The number of replies absolutely boggled my mind. I have sent out a few questionnaires in my term as a member. Never before have I had more returned and signed with the comment page filled with substance.

Some people do not think these questionnaires are even read. Other than members' pensions which get a real response from members, some of whom have tried to address it, one thing that surprised me was the reaction of the public on the need to reform the Young Offenders Act. I appreciate what the parliamentary secretary said. I was here when the Young Offenders Act came in. I was here in 1985 when the amendments came in.

In view of the horrors with young offenders and because of protection under that law, I am afraid the new Parliament better not wait for a year or two years but it better address the issue. It really has had a lot of response, certainly from my constituents. It is one of the consistent themes in the over 2,000 questionnaires I have received back.

Some may wonder about 2,000 questionnaires. I do not know how much experience some members have had, but I remember Pierre Elliott Trudeau in his heyday in 1968 sent out a questionnaire to his riding of Mount Royal of 50,000-plus and he received 760 back. He thought that was great. In my history, other than having sent out the last one, we get about 1,000 back. Just three years ago they did not even sign. There is always a little hook to get a constituent to sign so they can perhaps go