

File No. 5741 Continued.

OPINION.

Mr. Ritchie, Assistant City Solicitor, to myself, with reference thereto.

I concur in the conclusions reached by Mr. Ritchie.

Truly yours,

(Signed) W. Cabell Bruce,
City Solicitor.

.....

File No. 5746.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ELECTRICAL COMMISSION OF BALTIMORE CITY,
OFFICE OF CHIEF ENGINEER.

Baltimore, January 12, 1907.

Hon. W. Cabell Bruce,
City Solicitor.

Dear Sir:-

4257

At a meeting of the Electrical Commission held on Friday,
January 11, I was directed to ask your opinion on the following:-

Has the Commission the right, under leases with Companies
occupying duct space in the municipal conduits, to order services removed
where house connections have not been paid for within a reasonable time,
and where property owners to whom said connections have been billed enjoy
the advantages of service from telephone, telegraph, electric light,
etc., although they have not paid for said connection?

To make the matter clear to you, I will cite as follows:-

4258

~~Where house service distribution is contemplated in any district,~~
we make every endeavor to have the property owners sign an assent, blank,
permitting the Commission, in the construction of its distributing lines,
to cut through the foundation walls to complete the connections to build-
ings. In a number of instances this assent has been refused, and only
when the property owner or tenant have found that after poles and wires
had been removed they could not get service, other than underground, did
they come up and order these connections put in at their expense, they
being charged only for the actual time and labor necessary to put same
in. The Electrical Commission made it a rule to charge for these connec-
tions after assent had been refused before or during the course of our
regular work, on account of the additional expense of moving our gangs
for each little job. Now, in a number of instances, after these con-
nections had been built on the order of the property owner, the said