

the bank must fail unless it received assistance, and this position apparently was known for some time before.

(2) On the same day, about ten or eleven o'clock at night, certain directors of the Home Bank having proceeded to Ottawa by order of its directorate, to consult the government with regard to obtaining assistance, one or more of the directors met the Prime Minister (Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King), the Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) and other members of the cabinet at the Prime Minister's house, when the disclosure of the bank's affairs was made in such a manner and to such fearful purpose as to leave the Prime Minister aghast, and under the impression that if demands were made upon the bank within the next few days the bank could not meet them; and assistance was positively and absolutely refused—on which date the government became fully aware of the serious financial condition of the bank, and on that date the members of the government became aware by the statement of the directors themselves as to what the financial condition of the bank was. There was no pleading want of knowledge after that.

(3) On the following day, the 15th of August, the cabinet held a meeting having all this knowledge before it, which was doubtless fully discussed. I do not think I need even to state that undoubtedly such an important matter as this would be fully discussed.

(4) Not obtaining assistance from the government the directors and the Acting Finance Minister proceeded to Montreal on the evening of the same day, the 15th of August, and consulted financial interests there for the purpose of obtaining help. The interests consulted in Montreal could not give answer until the following morning the 16th of August, and when they did so, no help being forthcoming, the directors returned to Toronto, and I presume the Acting Finance Minister returned to Ottawa.

(5) The next day, the 17th of August, the bank failed and closed its doors, and I need only mention the sickening trail of suffering, poverty, hardship and alleged crime left in its wake.

(6) The Hon. James Murdock had a deposit in the Home Bank, Ottawa branch, to savings account, of several thousand dollars from about the 1st of July, 1923 to the 15th of August, 1923, the day of the cabinet meeting at which the financial condition of the Home Bank was fully known and doubtless was discussed, and on the same day and very shortly after the cabinet meeting adjourned, and just before the close of banking hours, the Hon. James Murdock withdrew from his deposit in

the Home Bank, Ottawa, having knowledge as such minister of its financial condition, thousands of dollars, and leaving only a small sum remaining to his credit, and from which he made further withdrawal, leaving only the infinitesimal sum of \$89 there when the bank failed. I think that is the amount he stated.

(7) That in making such withdrawal the Hon. James Murdock refused to accept a marked cheque in the usual course of business, and demanded cash or legals for the amount of his withdrawal, and it being near the close of banking hours, the strong box of the bank had to be re-opened to obtain the cash which was paid over to the minister.

(8) That immediately after such withdrawal the Hon. James Murdock re-deposited the same cash or legals he had withdrawn into another bank in Ottawa to his credit.

(9) That on the following day, 16th of August, the same legals withdrawn by the Hon. James Murdock from the Home Bank were returned to it by the Royal Bank through the clearing house at Ottawa.

(10) That the Hon. James Murdock did not use the said withdrawal at that time for any purpose, but deposited it in another bank.

(11) That thousands of depositors in the Home Bank lost their deposits, entailing poverty, hardship and ruin. Many of them lost all they had in the world.

(12) The Hon. James Murdock saved his deposit, thus profiting to the extent of thousands of dollars by making use of knowledge confidentially obtained as a minister of the Crown, through the means aforesaid; and in breach of his obligation as a minister of the Crown, and in violation of the honour, dignity and traditions of parliament.

The hon. minister had saved his deposit and profited to that extent, because had his money remained in the Home Bank, as did the money of these thousands of other depositors to whom I have referred, he would have lost that money. By his action he profited to the extent of thousands of dollars that he withdrew from the bank.

Now I challenge that this was in breach of his obligation as minister of the Crown and in violation of the honour, dignity and tradition of this parliament; and for these reasons I desire to move the following resolution, seconded by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie):

That E. Guss Porter, a member representing the electoral riding of West Hastings, in this House, having declared from his seat in the House, that he is credibly informed and that he believes he is able to establish by satisfactory evidence that:

The Honourable James Murdock, Minister of Labour, did withdraw from the Home Bank, at its Ottawa branch, on the 15th day of August, 1923, two days before such