proven to be overly complex so as to be ineffective and/or unenforceable.

• (1510)

I concur with and support these petitioners.

INCOME TAX

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions today. A total of 436 petitioners from the riding of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt call on Parliament to reduce government spending instead of increasing taxes and implement a taxpayer protection act to limit federal spending.

I concur with my petitioners.

Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition today from my constituents in New Westminster—Burnaby.

The petitioners wish to inform the government that they are already overburdened with taxation due to high government spending. They feel that the government will increases taxes in this afternoon's budget.

Therefore they pray and request that Parliament reduce government spending instead of increasing taxes and implement a taxpayer protection act to limit federal spending.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I also present two other petitions on behalf of those in my riding and in the general area.

These petitioners request that Parliament amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to include sexual orientation as a basis for protection against discrimination and to fully recognize relationships based on financial and emotional dependency and same sex relationships.

INCOME TAXES

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions today.

The first one is signed by over 2,500 people. The citizens express concern that they are overburdened with taxation due to high government spending and that the federal government is considering tax increases in the next federal budget.

Therefore the petitioners humbly pray and request that Parliament reduce government spending instead of increasing taxes.

FIREARMS

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my second petition is signed by 4,888 people from my riding.

The petitioners say that the control of law–abiding citizens and responsible gun owners is more than enough to ensure public safety, and the current and proposed laws criminalizing certain firearm activities are not necessary.

The petitioners humbly pray and request that Parliament support laws that will severely punish all violent criminals who use weapons in the commission of a crime, that Parliament support new Criminal Code firearms control provisions which recognize and protect the right of law–abiding citizens to own and use recreational firearms.

Finally, they request that Parliament support legislation that will repeal and modify existing gun control laws which have not improved public safety or have not proven to be cost effective.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On February 20, 1995 I brought a point of order pursuant to Standing Order 39 regarding a question that I placed on the Order Paper on September 30, 1994.

The hon. member for Kingston and the Islands was gracious enough to respond to my request. He indicated that I would have the answer to my question by the end of last week. It is 150 days now since I have placed my question on the order paper with no result.

Also, with all due respect to the member for Kingston and the Islands who chastised me for not going to the Library of Parliament for the information, may I tell the hon. member that the annual reports to which he referred me are bordering on useless they are so vague.

Once again I would like to place these questions on the Order Paper for 1992 and 1993: What was the total amount of funds received by individuals and groups from the Canada Council? Who were these individuals? For what specific projects did they receive funding? How much did they receive?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean–Paul Marchand (Québec–Est, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have a serious problem. I also placed a question on the Order Paper on October 19, 130 days ago. This question had two parts: a) and b). Finally, last Friday, after a little more than a hundred days, I received an answer to the first half of my question. You can see my problem.

I wonder if there is any hope of getting the second part of my question answered. I find this somewhat unfortunate because, frankly, the information requested in that part is simpler, shorter, yet more important to me. Can I appeal to someone to ask for some justice and get this answer?