

File No. 5390 Continued.

CORRESPONDENCE.

3883

Institute has been referred to me by the Board of School Commissioners for such action as may be necessary.

On examining Chapter 244 of the Act of 1906, Section 5, I am satisfied that the Board of Electrical examiners has no legal warrant to exact from the Polytechnic Institute the fee and charge which they claim. In my opinion Prof. Hall cannot be considered among the persons "engaged in business of or holding themselves out to the public as engaged in the business of installing, erecting or repairing or contracting to install, erect or repair electric wires or conductors," as described in Section 5 of the said act. I therefore do not feel authorized in allowing the money of the City to be used to pay this fee. As however the Commission claims that they have legal advice in the matter and the source which I propose may involve the City in litigation, I feel bound to submit it to you for your opinion and I will pursue the course which you advise. I do not find in section 12 of the Act a prohibition of work of this sort on the premises of the owner by himself or one of his regular employees.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Joseph Packard.

President Board of School Commissioners.

File No. 5390.

OPINION.

LAW DEPARTMENT.

Baltimore, November 2, 1906.

Hon. W. Cabell Bruce,
City Solicitor.

Dear Sir:-

3884

As requested by your favor of October 12, I have very carefully considered Mr. Packard's inquiry, as set forth in his letter to you of October 11. Mr. Packard desires to know whether Prof. Hall, who is the head of the Department of Science at the Polytechnic Institute, must take out a license and give bond under the Act of 1906, ch. 244, before doing electrical work at the plant of the Polytechnic Institute. In this connection, I have read Mr. King's letter to Mr. Van Sickle, of