

April 10, 1922

Dear Doctor,-

I have yours 8th respecting Panama City etc. The extent to which the OST should be responsible after a man has left the OST employ and territory is always a difficult question. However, your action was best in view of further letters.

Panama City is not on the OST and has been included in a service or claim. Additionally it has always been considered correct in business to not recognize a check to a business house indorsed by an individual. That is the protection an indorsement is intended to afford. The bank very properly recognized this fact and refused to pay it. However your settlement of the case is fair enough.

Mr. McKenna was put on after consultation with the president of the automobile club and several others here. He is a man of good family and a good wife, an ex-soldier, and of gentlemanly presence. He had shown a capacity here to do the sort of work needed in Florida. It seems his wife went to her family on a visit (she was to have traveled with him) and he fell in with another woman (as the story now appears) and then left the work and went to Panama City where they, or he, got to drinking. Soon as he got away from that he went to South Florida and asked his wife to join him. The wife and the father-in-law are now trying to get the whole matter cleared up. He is not apparently a drinking man, and he was square enough, sofar as I can find out, to go away and not involve the OST further after that mis-step. Since the meeting in Mobile I have been trying to get at the whole truth respecting him and the foregoing is about the story I am getting. I have not secured yet the sturn of the receipts, but of course am asking for them.

I have been without information myself except as those letters came in which you sent. I knew he had given up the work. I now have information his wife is with him and his family is beginning to get the story. I should know more soon, if there is more to be learned.

Very truly,