

File No. 10151 Continued.

CORRESPONDENCE.

7819

ble for the construction, or adjustment of the new drainage system required for the continued drainage of the street, was concurred in by the Sewerage Commission, and, as I am informed, after consultation with the then City Solicitor, W. Cabell Bruce.

Although the drainage appliances existing in the locality mentioned in the title to this letter, at the time of the beginning of the work of new paving last summer, were constructed at the cost of the Railways Company for the purpose of draining the street in connection with the tracks of the Company, yet, having been so constructed they were accepted by the City Commissioner (then having the powers now belonging to the City Engineer), and became a part of the system adopted by the City for the drainage of the street, to all intents and purposes as if constructed by the City itself. The Railways Company is under no greater obligation to pay the cost of the construction of the drainage appliances made necessary by the re-grading and repaving of the streets, than it is to pay any other part of the cost of the re-grading and repaving.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Bernard Carter,

Advisory Counsel.

File No. 10151.

OPINION.

LAW DEPARTMENT.

Baltimore, November 24th, 1909.

Bernard Carter, Esq.,

Advisory Counsel of the

United Railways and Electric

Company, Baltimore.

Dear Sir:-

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favor of the 22nd instant relative to the cost of the two new inlets at the southwest corner of Clifton avenue and Twelfth street.

When this question came up last summer I had several interviews with Mr. France on the subject, and at that time it was pretty

20