

Ambassador Hotel
Washington, D. C.
February 8, 1937.

Miss Marie Plummer
3503 Paseo
Kansas City, Missouri.

Dear Marie:

I have received your letter of the 2nd and am delighted to know that you have secured an extension. I also have received a 20-page letter from Judge B written with a pen. It is principally devoted to telling why he hadn't done anything in your behalf. He doesn't say he did anything to get your extension. All he said about that was:

"I assume that Miss Plummer has informed you that the Court has postponed its retrenchment order for six months in order to give her a chance to find a position."

In his letter of January 14th, he had this to say:

"We have two girls here and everyone must admit (certainly Miss Plummer does) that we have at this time no use for both of them. It is the first of the year and the Court decided that this was a good time to let one of them go. I asked the Court to retain Miss Plummer but my associates said that the statute provided that the clerk should appoint his deputy and that they were going to leave the selection of the deputy to him. I then asked the clerk to retain Miss Plummer but he said that he needed a bookkeeper and that the other girl was an excellent one; that she was a very intelligent girl and had learned almost at once when she first came here the intricacies of the whole office. That on the other hand, while Miss Plummer had been here ten years she could not run the docket to find a case. (I know as a fact that when Mr. McCoy appointed Miss Plummer, I asked her to learn the library so that she could

become ultimately a librarian. She has not taken any interest in the matter so far as I have been able to see.) I then told the clerk that I thought the last girl employed should be the first to go but that did not seem to impress him.”

In his letter of the 2nd he said:

“As to your statement that I dislike Miss Plummer, you are mistaken. I take exception to her attitude toward her duties but have the kindest feeling toward her otherwise.”

It seems from the foregoing, as I understand it, that you are to be employed until August 1st although you say the Court record, made at Judge Shain’s direction, provides that you are to be retained from day to day.

[page 2]

I don’t think you should count too confidently on staying until the first of August. The Court record is certainly a warning that you are liable to go any day.

You will note the Judge complains about your failure to become the Court’s librarian. If there is any opportunity for you to do this now you had better embrace it.

When everything is considered, however, my advise is to use every possible endeavor to get a fairly satisfactory job outside of the Court. I am satisfied that they are going to let you sooner or later and it is simply folly for you to postpone search for a job.

Enclosed find copy of the only reply I have made to the Judge’s 20-page letter. This was written with a pen on a piece of paper. If I should make the reply now that I intend to make when you get out of office I am quite sure it would result in your dismissal because I intend to tell him in very plain words what I think of the whole business.

If you can do so without embarrassment, I think you should get a copy of the order of the Court, or the purported order of the Court, providing for the appointment of the

Princess, including the number of the volume and the page where the order appears. From what you wrote me about this, the date of this order is important. Also get the number and page of the volume of the order for the adjournment of Court prior to the order for her appointment, the object being to show that the Court had adjourned for the summer when the appointment was made.

Keep me posted.

Hastily yours,