File No. 2690.

OPINION.

2382

2383

the discretion of the Water Board to require a bond, it would seem to be within its discretion to impose the premium either upon the employee or upon its general expense account. This, of course, under the terms of my opinion rendered to Mr. Quick, sould not be done if the Water Board were imperatively required by Section 5 of Article 54 of the City Code to exact bond of its employees.

Under the provisions of Section 87 of the City Charter, the compensation of subordinates in the employment of the Water Board is fixed, not by ordinance, but by the Water Engineer. The only limitation upon his power is the provision that the compensation of all the subordinates of the Board is not to exceed in the aggregate the amount appropriated by ordinance. Being free to fix the salary of a subordinate of the Board, the Water Engineer would seem to be at liberty to fix it at a certain sum with the understanding that the premium on the bond was to be paid by the Department, or at a higher sum sufficient to cover the premium, with the understanding that the premium was to be paid by the employee. Under either arrangement, the situation of the City would be the same. I return herewith all the papers handed me.

Truly yours,

(Signed) W. Cabell Bruce, City Solicitor.