

File No. 5395 Continued.

CORRESPONDENCE.

1301 WHEREAS, The people of Baltimore city, at the spring election of 1905, approved the Sewerage Loan under the impression that the money would be expended in an early development of the sanitary sewerage system; and

WHEREAS, The people at that time voted in favor of said loan under the belief that the sanitary sewers would be the first, if not the sole purpose for which said ten million (\$10,000,000) dollars would be expended; and

WHEREAS, It appears that the Sewerage Commission, in its effort to convince the public that it is about to begin actual work, has planned for an extension of the storm-water system before a piece of ground has been broken for the sanitary system; and

WHEREAS, It is universally admitted that an extension of our storm water system may be wise, but that the commencement of our sanitary system would be wiser; and

WHEREAS, It may be well at the very outset to understand some of the rights and powers of the Sewerage Commission under the enabling act of the general Assembly, be it

Resolved, That the City Solicitor be and he is hereby respectfully requested to inform the First Branch City Council as to whether the Sewerage Enabling Act contemplated the expenditure of any of the ten million (\$10,000,000) dollar loan in the extension of storm-water sewers as separate and distinct from sanitary sewers.

Be it further resolved, That the City Solicitor be also requested to inform this Body as to whether a contract let for the building of storm-water sewers, which storm-water sewers are not an actual and essential part of the intended sanitary sewerage system, can be brought under the scope of the Sewerage Loan.

Resolved, That the City Solicitor be requested to give his opinion as to whether Ordinance No. 492, introduced October 9, properly conforms to legal requirements as to advertisement, in view of another improper ordinance having been previously introduced.

File No. 5395.

OPINION.

LAW DEPARTMENT.

Baltimore, October 20, 1906.

A. S. Goldsborough, Esq.,
Chief Clerk of the First Branch
of the City Council.

Dear Sir:-

1302 Replying to the request of the First Branch for my opinion