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## Postal Thrift

## [By Albert Sidney Burleson, postmaster genera

## of the United States.]

The proponents of the postal savings system, arguing in support of the enactment of postal savings legislation, asserted that it would encourage among the people the formation of habits of economy and thrift. This assertion, however, was too general, judging by the results achleved since the system was put into effect on anuary 3, 1911. After more than four years of actual operation the postal savings system has conclusively proved not only that it has encouraged habits of thrift, but that it has done so with ut injury to the savings banks of the country. In asmuch as these banks did not show during the first year, and have not shown since then, any decrease in deposits to account for the millions in the custody of the postal savings system, it may be taken for granted that practically all the savings taken in by the postal authorities consist of money that was not saved prior to 1911 or that had been kept hidden, or both.
Yet there is little doubt that today there may be $\$ 50,000,000$ more that could be added to the al eadystupendoustotal of approximately $\$ 54,700$, 000 in the postal savings system Oct. 31 last. The sum mentioned is kept beyond reach of the postal savings system by the provisions of the law which limit the amount that may be accepted from a depositor to $\$ 100$ in a calendar month and restrict his maximum deposit to $\$ 500$. In compliance with recommendations made by the post office department and the president, congress passed last spring a law increasing the maximum, but limiting the amount "on which interest shall be paid to $\$ 1,000$." This law was vetoed by the president because of a senate amendment which enabled state banks and trust companies to receive deposits of the postal savings system regardless of whether they were members of the federal reserve system or not The president desires a law that can be co-ordinated with the provisions of the reserve law. The money which goes into the postal banks is at once deposited in the government's depository banks and thus enters the channels of trade.
The $\$ 500$ limitation was essentially experi mental and now has outlived its usefulness. Its mental and now has outlived its usefulness. Its
retention will seriously impair the intended utilretention will seriously impair the intended util-
ity of the service, which is to restore to business uses a large amount of money secreted by skepuses a large amount of mon
tical or ignorant foreigners.
The greater part of the segregated $\$ 50,000,000$ and this estimate is substantially correct, be cause it is based upon official reports - ough to be in circulation toserve the purposes of liquid currency. It represents funds that will not find their way into the average bank, especially in the great cities, because many prospective depositors do not know its officials. This is true especially of foreign-born wage-earners, but there are many of our own citizens who are equally skeptical.
When the postal savings system was in its legislative stages there existed an apprehension in financial circles that the innovation would draw large sums of money from the channels of trade. Actual experience has shown that that apprehension was unfounded. The American Bankers' association has officially gone on record in favor of the postal savings system, with the statement that "there ha: been no complaint anywhere tending to show that any considerable amount of money had been isposited with the government that would have $g$ ne into the bank had the postal savings system not been in operation."
We must bear in mind that a considerable number of the wage-earners in this country are either foreign-born or of foreign citizenship Very many of them, though distrustful of banks, vere familiar with the postal savings systems in posit their earning with them to seek to de osit their earnings with the United States gov , They know that the government will reep faith with them; but they can not understand why it will safeguard part of their sav ings and not all of them! The testimony o postmasters is almost unanimous on the poin that, when foreigners tender larger amount than can be legally accepted at present, which are therefore refused, they usually decline to open an account at all. T-e result is that either such money goes back into hiding or is tendered the money-order windows and sent to foreign postal banks.
Why permit this money to be returned to hiding and disuse?
I am convinced that the interest of the public
will be best served by ultimately removing altogether the restrictions on the amount that may ee accepted on deposit, but this condition should e approached gradually and as experience in administering the system indicatés that addition al steps may be taken toward the desired goal. In my annual report I recommended that the maximum balance which may be accepted be in creased, under certain conditions, to $\$ 2,000$, but imiting the amount on which interest shall paid to $\$ 1,000$.
The war has brought out more forcibly than ever, the usefulness of the postal savings system. it is a strong factor in quieting financial dis turbances, and with the advent of the war deosits at the American post offices began to gro y leaps and bounds. According to the lates vailable statistics, upward of $\$ 10,000,000$ ha been added since August to the total of deposit or reasons directly due to the war, and if the restrictions had not existed this sum might have been trebled.

Another interesting point is that every bank failure since 1912 has been followed by substantial increases in deposits at the postal savings stations in the respective neighborhoods. But again the postal savings system has suffered be cause of its restrictions. There is an instance in the official records which shows the withdrawa of a single account of $\$ 9,600$ from a suspecte savings bank. The depositor tendered the mount at the post office, and upon learning that only $\$ 100$ a month, and a similar sum for fiv months, could be accepted, he bought mone orders on an Italian post office and made his de posit in Italy. These cases are not the erception; hey are the rule. Yet it is very likely that in asmuch as the bank in question was solvent ad qualified as a depository, the very fund han and the ered by the panic-stricken Italian would have been returned to the very
Of course, the postal awth.
Of course, the postal authorities are proud of the postal savings system. On October 31 las there were 9,639 offices with more than 10,000 epositories (which includes branches and sta ions) in operation in the United States, Porto Rico and Hawaii. On that date there were about 475,000 depositors, and the amount on deposi was about $\$ 54,700,000$, which is exelusive of $\$ 5$, 08,060 witharawn by depositors for the purpose of buying postal savings bonds. The total repre ented an average of $\$ 115$ per depositor. In ear there had been a gain of more than 50,00 lepositors.
The increase in October was about $\$ 3,500$,000 and is the second largest since the system began operation. New York City, with $\$ 7,505$ 829 . eads all offices, with an average daily ceipt during that month of 60,000 .
Some interesting sidelights on the working of the system are given by the statistical table year ending June 30, 1914. New York leads in total, but Chicago, second in the ist, has an average principal per depositor 130 , against New York's average of \$98. Ro yn, Washington, has the highest individual a erage, of \$257, although it is the forty-second n rank. Providence, Rhode Island, has the low est average, with $\$ 70$, and is twenty-ninth in the list. Brooklyn, which is part of New York poitically, has an average of $\$ 80$ per depositor, bu $s$ third in rank as a city.
By states, equally interesting facts are obtain ble. New York is first in rank; South Carolina s last, with $\$ 20,923$ on deposit. Hawail is nex and the very lowest, with $\$ 19,395$. Texas, the argest state in the union, is also at the bottom of the list with little more than $\$ 500,000$.
It would seem from statistics that the highest otals and the highest averages obtuin in states and cities, respectively, where the foreign ele ment is strongest. Agricultural communities d not show, on a given basis, as high an averag or total as communities where industrial pursuit are the rule. Yet this does not signify that the agricultural population is less thrifty; becaus the postal savings facilitien may not appeal to the rural population as they do to the city wage earners, and also because there is a tendency on leferred of agriculturaists to buy farms on the deferred payment plan. Possible savings of cash therefore, are turned into real estate.
York Independent.

If the republicans insist upon making the next campaign upon protection issue-and who doubts it-then common gratitude would dictate hat Boies Penrose should be the presidentia nominee. We have the word of Mr. Penrose himself that his Pennsylvania triumph was due to his ardent championship of that ancient

