

I feel that if public necessity demanded it, then any addition in the line of adding contiguous territory would be within the proper action of Congress, but as I feel now, the Westchester County banks, and the banks of group 6, are supplying all the needs of the communities and settlements in which they are located and I can see no necessity of adding that clause.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you, Mr. Edie.

**STATEMENT OF W. F. BLEAKLEY, REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL BANKS OF THE COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER AND THE YONKERS NATIONAL BANK OF YONKERS, N. Y.**

The CHAIRMAN. Do you present yourself to the same propositions?

Mr. BLEAKLEY. Yes, sir; and representing the national banks of the county of Westchester, which number 26, and more particularly the Yonkers National Bank of Yonkers, N. Y.

I notice that there does not appear to be any representation on behalf of the New York City banks seeking any amendment to the act and that is probably due to the fact that our State banking law does not permit of the creation of branch banks outside of the municipal limits.

It seems to me, without desiring to be facetious, that the best remedy, in view of the State banks interested, is for the City of Cleveland to extend the limits to take in these banks that have appeared here from the city of Cleveland.

Mr. MARLATT. May I interrupt to say that you will get the largest fee you ever earned, or ever earned in your life, if you will come out and solve that problem for not only the banks, but the city of Cleveland.

A VOICE. And I will add Cincinnati.

Mr. BLEAKLEY. The fact of the matter remains that the governor of our State has already advocated the consolidation of counties and in the not distant future we may expect New York State to enact an act in which a number of counties will be consolidated and if that be true, this very amendment that the Cleveland bankers seek to have inserted in this act will permit of the extension of the New York City banks, with the problems which we have to meet and which have been answered by Mr. Edie and also by Mr. Vinson, to all these counties.

Our difficulties lie in this: We have, in the county of Westchester, three cities immediately adjacent to the county of New York, and already one bank, with 63 branches, is knocking at our doors. But a few blocks away is one branch bank.

We are able to afford banking facilities to any amount demanded to the inhabitants of our territory and we feel, with the adoption of these amendments, that the New York banks will be permitted to come into the territory and with their ample facilities and ability to decrease the discount rate and increase the interest rates, that the banks which have been institutions there for more than 100 years and where the stockholders are, to a great extent, depositors, will be imperiled.

We merely want to say that if it is the policy of this bill to prevent state-wide branch banks, this insertion is going to do just to the contrary to a great extent, because it will permit the extension of those branches into a large territory not even in contemplation, if the proposed amendment is adopted.