

File No. 9705 Continued.

CORRESPONDENCE.

plant could be duplicated for less than half that amount.

We have in our specifications, as Mr. Rolf states, that they should be charged no wharfage and that water would be furnished free. That was done with a view of decreasing as much as possible the cost of the work and prevent the City from paying 10 or 20% on the cost of same.

If out of town contractors are required to pay taxes on a plant brought here temporarily, for the purpose of using same on City work, I should feel it my duty to advise bidders that such charges would be made in drawing all future specifications.

I would respectfully request your opinion in reference to this matter.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) O. F. Lackey,

Harbor Engineer.

File No. 9705.

BERNARD ROLF.

Baltimore, March 8, 1909.

Mr. O. F. Lackey,
Harbor Engineer.

Dear Sir:-

I have received notice from the Appeal Tax Court that it is their intention to tax the plant which I have on the work building Piers Nos. 4, 5 and 6, at a valuation of \$60,000.00.

Taxation of this plant by the City of Baltimore I protest against, as being in violation of the spirit of the contract. This City, for the sake of increasing the number of competitors and getting as low a price as possible for doing the work, has, by means of advertisements in papers outside of the City, invited bidders to submit proposals on this work, but in no portion of the specifi-