

they serve. Well, here we have two provinces, Mr. Speaker, where somebody who is called to duty does not receive any money at all, while in another province they receive \$30 a day.

It is not only the system that is not fair at the federal level in terms of the policy-making end of it, but also at the provincial level where the provinces are not treating the jurors on an equal basis.

British Columbia, for instance, pays \$10 for the first day and after the first day it is \$20 per day and after 10 days it is \$30 per day. In Nova Scotia, jurors are paid \$15 per day.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, the government in its wisdom thought that it was a provincial responsibility but one could ask, what would happen if a juror is called to the Federal Court? There is no provincial say in what happens at the Federal Court because the Federal Court falls within the jurisdiction of the federal government. Is the federal government going to say that those people who appear in the Federal Court will qualify to collect UI but if they appear in provincial court they will not qualify?

Mr. Speaker, that is somewhat unfair. I can see it is six o'clock.

An hon. member: Maybe we will have a chance to debate this question again.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The time provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired.

[Translation]

Pursuant to Standing Order 93, the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 39 is deemed to have been moved.

Adjournment Debate

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on this question because I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question in the House the other day about the relocation of the Farm Credit Corporation headquarters to Regina.

At the time, I saw the move as being unnecessary and I indicated that it is going to cost farmers a price they cannot afford. At the same time I indicated that the burden of these increased costs will fall squarely on the shoulders of the farmers themselves. I also indicated that the relocation will make the credit office headquarters significantly less accessible to a variety of Canadian support groups.

In my statement I clearly indicated that the office, if it is to be relocated as the government has indicated to make it easier for farmers to borrow money, one would understand. However, the reality is that the move of these offices to Regina will not benefit the farmers any more than they would benefit if the offices were located where they are right now.

Simply put, the regional offices that already exist in the provinces are in charge of giving loans to the farmers. The offices right now in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, mostly concentrate on developing strategic plans with ministers and with federal departments.

In my question to the minister I asked him to clarify for us why the government decided on a move at this point in time, on the verge of an election being called in Saskatchewan.

Also I asked him to give us the rationale for this move. What sort of a study has the government done? What sort of justification has it? I asked him the question twice hoping to get an answer from him, but unfortunately rather than answering my question, he moved on and started fighting with the NDP.

I can understand that there is a bone to be picked between the minister and the NDP but I think it is also a serious matter. The people of Saskatchewan are wondering now what will happen if the Conservatives do not win in Saskatchewan. Would the government carry on with its move, or will it be cancelled altogether?

I would like to ask the minister to give us a complete analysis of what has taken place to lead the government to the conclusion that this office had to be moved out of here.