

not understand that in that respect Mr. Macdonnell means to take issue—

Senator EDGE. I think in explanation—just a word—that I recall during Doctor Willis's testimony—and I do not say this in any way that any inference could be drawn that is unfair—but I think several members of the committee, including myself, asked a number of questions during the presentation, in order to try to get a division between the State banks, members of the system and matters of failure and other leading matters that were not brought out in the original testimony. I think you referred to something of that kind in your opening. The committee asked a question that might raise the inference that he was interested in making a case the other way.

Senator GLASS. That was in connection with his disengenousness and the witness used the words "hired apologist," and, for myself, I say Doctor Willis is not a man of that description. I think it is an implication totally unjustified by the fact and I appeal to this committee if Doctor Willis did not state, with the utmost frankness, his whole relationship to this matter.

Senator EDGE. Undoubtedly.

Senator GLASS. That is the point I am making.

The CHAIRMAN. I think he did, Senator Glass, and I think a little of the sting is taken out of the suggestion by the fact that Mr. Macdonnell replied he was in the same category.

Senator GLASS. I might say for both that I do not think Mr. Macdonnell is here in a purely mercenary capacity, nor Doctor Willis either.

Senator EDGE. Even lawyers—you and I—can speak impersonally—

Senator GLASS. Why talk to me impersonally about lawyers. I have been a victim of lawyers all my life.

The CHAIRMAN. You are speaking of Virginia lawyers—not Philadelphia lawyers, are you not?

Senator GLASS. Nobody has yet gotten the best of a Philadelphia lawyer.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Paton, I understand, desires to make a statement to the committee. We will hear him now.

#### STATEMENT OF THOMAS B. PATON

Mr. PATON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I simply want to make clear the position of the American Bankers Association on this proposition, especially with regard to the branch-bank provision of H. R. 2.

Back in 1916 the question first arose in the association with regard to branch banking in the Kansas City convention, and after a debate then held, it went on record in the form of a motion, which was adopted by a large majority, that the association is opposed to branch banking in any form. Following that the subject again came before the annual convention in 1922 in New York. The convention floor was thrown open as a forum for the proponents of both sides of the question and this was the resolution adopted in October, 1922:

*Resolved by the American Bankers Association.* That we view with alarm the establishment of branch banking in the United States and the attempt to permit