

2, Chas Hanback

examination in Washington, D.C., for the testimony of Gilbert Adams, who, you stated, was in this city. You made no mention of comrades Money and Cook, hence the reviewer had no way of determining whether you had seen them or made an effort in that direction.

It was your duty, before returning the case, to exhaust all sources of information within the limits of your district. Such is the rule now and has always been, and said rule is not obsolete, and is not likely to become so, notwithstanding your declaration that it should.

Had you stated in your first, as you have stated in your second report, that comrade Money was dead; that comrade Cook had removed to Philadelphia, and that nothing further could be accomplished in your district, the Bureau would have been able to act upon the case promptly and intelligently, and you would not have been charged with faulty work.

In this connection it is deemed proper to call your attention to the summary of your second report. In the first place, you are informed that your appeal should not appear in the summary of the report in the claim under investigation, but should be made in a separate communication. The propriety of this should be obvious to you, when the language employed in your report is taken into consideration. The summary of a special examiner should not contain matter irrelevant to the claim, Comments upon the intelligence of the officials passing upon the case is not expected or desired, but, on the other hand, is forbidden. The expression of an honest difference of opinion and reasons therefor are proper, but it is manifestly in very bad taste for a special examiner to assume superior intelligence and offensively express it as you

3 1/2 @xxx

SC4126-85-97