

WAR, NAVY AND AGRICULTURE POSTS GIVING ROOSEVELT MOST TROUBLE IN NAMING CABINET

President-Elect Still Is Hopeful of Persuading Carter Glass to Be Treasury Chief; Farley Only Sure Bet.

BY RAY TUCKER
Times Staff Writer

WASHINGTON, Feb. 18.—President-Elect Roosevelt was reported today to be approaching the final makeup of his cabinet as a result of conferences with prospective members while passing through the capital en route from Miami to Hyde Park.

Though subject to last-minute changes before he makes it public on March 2 or 3, the situation with respect to the cabinet is said to be as follows:

Secretary of State—Senator Cordell Hull of Tennessee, unless shifts resulting from other refusals necessitate his transfer to the treasury.

Secretary Treasury—Senator Carter Glass of Virginia is inclined to refuse. He prefers the senate, and has not been convinced that he can not be of more service there than in an executive department. But Mr. Roosevelt still is hopeful of persuading the distinguished Virginian to enter his official family.

Attorney General—Senator Thomas J. Walsh of Montana, though reluctant to quit the senatorial field, is understood to have consented to take charge of the department of justice.

Farley Is Sure Bet

Postmaster General—National Chairman James A. Farley a sure bet.

Labor Secretary—Miss Frances Perkins, industrial commissioner of New York and Roosevelt adviser, the most likely candidate, despite previous tests of the American Federation of Labor and her willingness to be left out in order to relieve Mr. Roosevelt of embarrassment.

Interior Secretary—Senator Bronson Cutting (Rep., N. M.) still unwilling to quit the progressive bloc in the senate, but Mr. Roosevelt hopeful he can persuade the wealthy progressive to join forces with the "new deal." If Cutting refuses, some young western progressive, with ex-Governor La Follette of Wisconsin frequently mentioned, is a possibility.

Commerce Secretary—William H. Woodin of New York, Jess L. Strauss of New York and Henry L. Harriman of Boston, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, are under consideration to have a good chance because appointment of either Woodin or Strauss, with Farley and Miss Perkins, would make the cabinet topheavy with New Yorkers.

Trouble on Three Posts

The posts giving Mr. Roosevelt most trouble are said to be war, navy and agriculture, especially the last.

Henry A. Wallace, Des Moines editor, has been thought to be in the lead for the farm job, with Frank Murphy of Minneapolis and Henry Morgenthau Jr. of New York also mentioned. Morgenthau, however, is believed to be sure for assistant secretary of agriculture.

Wallace's chances are thought to have decreased because of his recent declaration in favor of "controlled inflation" through cutting the gold content of the dollar and remonetization of silver. In conferences with other prospective cabinet members, the President-elect is said to have given assurance that he will not stand for any tampering with the currency.

As this setup indicates that two southerners, three westerners and three New Yorkers may be in the cabinet, it is thought the war and navy posts will be allocated to New England, the southern Atlantic seaboard—possibly Georgia or the coast.

HUNTING SCENES FOUND ON ANCIENT PAVEMENT

Large Mosaic in Syrian Ruins Shows Animals at Bay.

By Science Service

PRINCETON, N. J., Feb. 18.—Scenes of brave hunters facing wild animals are revealed on a large mosaic pavement unearthed at Daphne in Syria. A report received here says that the discovery was made by the committee for the excavation of Antioch and its vicinity, the headquarters of which are at Princeton university.

Exact antiquity of the important mosaic is not determined, but the spirit of the drawing has led archaeologists to assign it to the late third or fourth century A. D. The expedition will excavate the building completely this spring.

One large mosaic panel of the pavement, about 22 feet square, depicts hunters on horseback in a smaller panel depicting hunters at sea.

A central medallion contains a bust named "Megalopsychia" in reference to the great mental courage of the hunters in meeting the beasts. The border, now damaged, badly represented scenes from Daphne.

Handwriting Reveals

Civilization began when man learned to write. Picture writing, hieroglyphics, letters and an alphabet—that was the development.

The authentic history of man begins with his written records.

GRAPHOLOGY, the science of determining the character, or at least some of the characteristics, of an individual from his handwriting, is not fully telling, and it has a real scientific basis.

There is nothing very mysterious about it, and any individual can learn at least enough about the science to amuse himself and his friends by "analysing" handwriting and telling enough of a person's characteristics from it to startle and interest one who has not studied the subject.

Our Washington Bureau has prepared one of its interesting bulletins on this subject, from which you may secure the groundwork knowledge of this art. Fill out the coupon below and send for it!

CLIP COUPON HERE

Department 211, Washington Bureau, The Indianapolis Times, 1322 New York avenue, Washington, D. C.

I want a copy of the bulletin on GRAPHOLOGY, and enclose herewith 5 cents in coin, or loose, uncanceled U. S. postage stamps to cover return postage and handling costs.

NAME
ST. & NO.
CITY
STATE
I am a reader of The Indianapolis Times (Code No.)

SILENT SAM CRACKS; CONVICTS KILLER

Strain of Hours, Without a Word Spoken, Brings Confession

This is the tenth of a series of stories based on information from the files of the United States bureau of investigation and other sources telling for the first time the bureau's agents' part in famous mysteries.

BY LOU WEDMAR
Times Staff Writer

SPECIAL AGENT J-4, of the United States bureau of investigation, was in a disconsolate mood as he watched the tropic liner, Western World, warp into her Hudson river pier in April, 1928.

His assignment was one of the most difficult he had received in years. This was a case of murder on the high seas, often impossible to solve, because of the channelling of sailors.

They had their own customs, their own laws. The whole crew was guilty until proved innocent.

The cable from Rio de Janeiro told little.

Bernard Suarez, 20, killed aboard liner Western World two days ago, the cable said. "Crew refuses to talk."

He went aboard the ship as soon as she docked, identifying himself to the customs men and immediately disappearing among the crew.

Below decks he waited until the rush of unloading had abated, listening to the crew's gossip in several languages—J-4 was a linguist—and trying to pick up some information that might be of value.

He was satisfied, during those first hours in the liner's hold, that his identity remained unknown.

Life is ordinarily as safe aboard ship as on Broadway, but the fact remained that one murder had been committed there. Another was not impossible. The crew lived in a world apart from the passengers.

When things had quieted down, but before the men began going on shore leave, he sought the chief engineer. Identifying himself, the agent was taken to his quarters.

"What happened to this man Suarez?" J-4 asked.

"I'd like to see the passageway," J-4 suggested.

The dark, damp corridor told him nothing. The blood-stains had been removed by the crew's diligent scrubbing.

"By the way, Captain. What was the weapon used?"

The Captain paused.

"That's the funny thing," he said. "Apparently he was stabbed with a long-bladed knife, but we couldn't find any trace of it. Julio Beldana, the cook, I was telling you about, didn't miss any hardware from the galley."

We searched the crew, but couldn't find a single knife. Probably went overboard."

J-4 had one rule that frequently helped him in his work. When an unusually circumstance appeared in a case, he concentrated on that circumstance until it was explained fully.

"There were any quarrels over women?"

"No. Suarez was in the galley for a while, on the second watch on March 20. Then he went out. Later one of my men ran up and told me, 'Suarez has been stabbed.'"

"Where did you find him?"

"In a passage leading toward the bow."

"And nobody around?"

"Nobody."

"Let me see the crew, one at a time."

Interrogation of them added nothing to the engineer's state-



The Western World

The Spaniard shook his head. "Well," J-4 said softly, "neither do I. What do you know about the murder of Bernard Suarez?"

"I don't know anything," replied the Spaniard.

Further than that, he would not say.

J-4 left him, after taking the precaution of suggesting that Sam be kept aboard ship for a day or two.

He communicated with the police and a routine search for Beldana was instituted. Harlem detectives also offered him some interesting information—Beldana and Suarez had been admirers of the same girl when the Western World was previously in New York.

J-4 tried in vain to locate the girl. Early the next morning, however, he learned that Beldana had been taken off a coastal vessel by the marine police, who were holding him for questioning.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.

The agent interviewed him, but without result. No, he had not killed Suarez. No, he had not argued with him. Yes, he had seen him aboard the ship.