

File No. 10178 Continued.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MILLER & BONSAI,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW.
OFFICES: 511-515 CALVERT BUILDING.

Baltimore, July 30, 1909.

Edgar A. Poe, Esq.,
City Solicitor.

Dear Sir:

Briefly I allude to a question you brought up yesterday.

7878 Although you are of opinion that present specifications call for 5-ply material, you observed that there had been some doubt, owing to specifications not being drawn up very well. This doubt might excuse Mr. Preston from any wilful wrong interpretation, but I submit that when you have resolved the doubt, and given your legal interpretation that 5-ply is called for, that then what follows should be as it would have been had the specifications been drawn up in the most perfect manner, in which event you would never have had any doubt.

I call your attention to the fact that Mr. Preston has ~~never~~ given an adequate reason for alterations, - that he has never shown any "unforeseen necessity". His explanation that Board of Awards authorized alterations has been abandoned.

His position now, and the position of Van Dorn, is that there has been no variations from specifications. This is clearly untenable, and the city should not fear any law suit based on such a contention.

I desire to see the best material used at Jail, and Van Dorn surely is not.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Leigh Bonsal.

File No. 10178.

OPINION.

LAW DEPARTMENT.

Baltimore, August 3, 1909.

Hon. J. Barry Mahool,
Mayor of Baltimore.

Dear Sir:

79 As requested by you, I herewith submit the following opinion upon the proper interpretation of the specifications, for additions and